

published monthly since 1866

Fortnightly

FOUNDED IN 1865 BY ANTHONY TROLLOPE

JULY, 1951

MXV N.S.

Illincis' U Library

CONTENTS

THE INDIANS IN SOUTH AFRICA	C. W. M. GELL
TAINT AND THE RISE OF ARAB NATIONALISM	NEVILL BARBOUR
GLO-CANADIAN TRADE AND THE WHEAT CONTRACT	LESLIE BISHOP
HAT'S WRONG WITH LOCAL GOVERNMENT?	LORD SILKIN
ENTISM AND PROFESSOR BARBARA WOOTTON	
	I. J. B. COATES
	II. BARBARA WOOTTON
CINE AND THE EUROPEAN TRADITION	DENIS SAURAT
LE ON THE SIERRA	TERENCE DENNIS
THE WEATHER HOUSE— <i>A Poem</i>	DENISE FOLLIOT
THE CULT OF SHERLOCK HOLMES	G. F. McCLEARY
Correspondence—OTTO FRIEDMAN	

The Fortnightly Library :

HAT OF LIBERTY ? OWEN HICKEY

Other Contributors : Asa Briggs, Pamela Hinkson, Gordon Winter, W.
Thomson Hill, F. W. Wentworth-Shields, Joseph Braddock, Grace Banyard.

U.K. 3S. 6D. or
U.S.A. 55 CENTS
CANADA 60 CENTS

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

42S. PER ANNUM or
U.S.A. \$6.50
CANADA \$7.00

ALL CLASSES
OF INSURANCE •
TRANSACTED

MOTOR UNION
INSURANCE COMPANY LIMITED
10, ST. JAMES'S STREET, LONDON, S.W.I



Welcome
to the Inns of Britain

beer is best

Issued by the Brewers' Society, 42 Portman Square, London, W.1

THE FORTNIGHTLY

Published Monthly by *The Fortnightly Review, Ltd.*, at 4, 5 & 6, Soho Sq., London, W.1.

JULY, 1951

CONTENTS

	PAGE
THE INDIANS IN SOUTH AFRICA. C. W. M. GELL	429
BRITAIN AND THE RISE OF ARAB NATIONALISM. BY NEVILL BARBOUR ...	439
ANGLO-CANADIAN TRADE AND THE WHEAT CONTRACT. BY LESLIE BISHOP ...	446
WHAT'S WRONG WITH LOCAL GOVERNMENT ? BY LORD SILKIN	454
SCIENTISM AND PROFESSOR BARBARA WOOTTON. I. BY J. B. COATES ...	461
II. BY BARBARA WOOTTON	467
RACINE AND THE EUROPEAN TRADITION. BY DENIS SAURAT	474

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

British Islands in the Southern Hemisphere

The post-war histories of some of the smaller and more remote territories of the British Colonial Empire.

(Cmd. 8230)

3s. 6d. (3s. 9d.)

Work of the Children's Department

The Sixth Report of the department dealing with the welfare of children deprived of normal home life and juvenile delinquency which remains far above pre-war level.

4s. 0d. (4s. 3d.)

National Coal Board

Annual Report and Statement of Accounts for the year 1950.

(H.C. 188.)

5s. 6d. (5s. 10d.)

Prices in brackets include postage

HIS MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE

York House, Kingsway, London W.C.2 ; 429 Oxford Street, London W.1. (Post Orders: P.O. Box 569, London S.E.1.); 13A Castle Street, Edinburgh 2 ; 39 King Street, Manchester 2 ; 2 Edmund Street, Birmingham 3 ; 1 St. Andrew's Crescent, Cardiff ; Tower Lane, Bristol 1 ; 80 Chichester Street, Belfast

OR THROUGH ANY BOOKSELLER

CONTENTS—*contd.*

FIRE ON THE SIERRA. BY TERENCE DENNIS	480
THE WEATHER HOUSE— <i>A Poem.</i> BY DENISE FOLLIOT	484
THE CULT OF SHERLOCK HOLMES. BY G. F. McCLEARY	485
<i>Correspondence</i> —OTTO FRIEDMAN.	488

THE FORTNIGHTLY LIBRARY :

WHAT OF LIBERTY ? BY OWEN HICKEY	489
----------------------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----

Other Contributors : *Asa Briggs, Pamela Hinkson, Gordon Winter, W. Thomson Hill, F. W. Wentworth-Sheilds, Joseph Braddock, Grace Banyard.*

- ¶ While the Editor is glad to consider articles offered for publication, he cannot undertake to return MSS. unless accompanied by a stamped envelope.
- ¶ The Editorial Advertising and General Business Offices of THE FORTNIGHTLY are at 4, 5 & 6, Soho Square, London, W.1.
- ¶ Entered as second-class matter, January 4, 1934, at the Post Office at New York, N.Y., under the Act of March 3, 1897 (Sec. 397 P.L. & R.).
- ¶ Registered for transmission by Canadian Magazine Post.

WHERE TO STAY

WELLINGTON HOTEL

TUNBRIDGE WELLS.

Delightfully situated at the summit of the Common facing South. Private suites at moderate terms. Lock-up Garage. Passenger Lift. First-class management.

Hot and cold water and gas fires in bedrooms.

UNSURPASSED FOR SITUATION AND SERVICE

Telephone : 1150. Proprietors : Trust Houses Ltd.

LASTINGHAM GRANGE HOTEL, YORKSHIRE

A charming country house on Yorkshire's beautiful moors. Own farm and garden produce. Genuine hospitality. Terms 5gns. to 8gns. Brochure sent on request. Tel. Lastingham 45.

LLANGOLLEN. Hand Hotel. One of the best in N. Wales. H. & C. water all rooms. Facing River Dee, free fishing (trout). A.A. & R.A.C. Tel. 3207.

"WHOSOEVER will, let him take the WATER of LIFE freely". (Rev. xxii, 17)

WATER AND THE SPIRIT THE NEW SACRAMENT FOR THE NEW DISPENSATION

For
HEALING and DELIVERANCE
in the TRIBULATIONS now in
evidence preceding the
THE COMING of THE LORD

Write to
THE PANACEA SOCIETY,
Bedford, England

THERE IS NOTHING TO PAY

THE FORTNIGHTLY

JULY, 1951

THE INDIANS IN SOUTH AFRICA

BY C. W. M. GELL

INDIANS first came to South Africa in 1860 as indentured labourers for the Natal sugar plantations for which Native labour was too scarce and unreliable. Between 1866 and 1874 the Government of India, which was never keen about the enterprise, suspended emigration and only allowed its resumption after powerful representation from Natal. There is much evidence from private persons and public commissions that the prosperity of Natal in the closing decades of the nineteenth century was largely based on "coolie" labour. Even in the face of considerable anti-Indian agitation after 1880 the planters (and later the mine owners and railways) successfully urged that immigration continue and the supply of indentured labour was only finally stopped in 1911 by the Government of India (despite the urgent entreaty of the South African Government) because of the treatment which Indians were then receiving in the Union. Up to that time over 12,000 Indians had come to South Africa as indentured labourers. When the three, and later five, years of their indentures finished, the Indians were free to work as ordinary salaried labourers, to return to India or to obtain a grant of Crown land in the Colony in lieu of their passage home. These free Indians became artisans, agricultural workers, market gardeners, fishermen and domestic servants. Their numbers were augmented from 1880 by the arrival of Indian traders from Mauritius and the Bombay Presidency and some of these latter spread into the Cape Province and the Transvaal. The growth of the Indian community in Natal is shown thus (in thousands) :

Year	* No. of I's			Year	No. of I's		
	Europeans	Indians	per 100 E's		Europeans	Indians	per 100 E's
1870	14	6	43	1911	98	133	136
1880	25	21	84	1921	137	142	104
1891	47	41	87	1936	191	184	96
1904	97	101	104	1946	233	228	98

In 1911 there were 11,072 Indians in the Transvaal and 6,609 in the Cape. Up to 1911 immigration was the chief factor ; thereafter the increase was almost entirely natural. Of these totals after 1911 approximately 52 per cent. are Tamils and Telugus from the Madras Presidency

* These figures are for Asiatics but, as less than 0.5% are non-Indians, they are quoted as for Indians.

and 29 per cent. are Hindi-speaking Biharis. Nearly all these are Hindus and are original indentured labourers or their descendants. The South African belief that these "coolies" (as all Indians are derogatorily known throughout South Africa) came from the lowest castes is not well-founded. They came naturally enough from the most poverty-stricken parts of India but, although reliable statistics do not exist for the whole period of immigration, of the 7,947 who passed through Calcutta from Bihar and Orissa in 1875-1876, 21 per cent. were Brahmins, 41 per cent. Kshatriyas and Vaisyas, and 38 per cent. Sudras. The remaining 19 per cent. of the total figures are Gujeratis from the Bombay Presidency, mostly Muslims, who came as free immigrants. They belong predominantly to the commercial and clerical classes.

The figures support Hofmeyr's verdict that : "If our history proves anything it is this—that however we may regard our Asiatic problem, the fact that it came into existence is due to the European, and to the European alone." There is, however, one proviso : from as early as 1885 the Transvaal Republic had passed discriminatory legislation to segregate Indians residentially "on account of their neglect of sanitary measures and loathsome mode of living." Nor could they ever aspire to the rights of citizenship ; and there was obvious force in Lord Milner's comment : "The Asiatics are strangers forcing themselves upon a community reluctant to receive them." However, the Transvaal Government did not take effective steps to exclude them and cannot, therefore, disclaim all responsibility for their arrival. The Orange Free State on the other hand expelled its few Indians in 1891 and allowed no more to enter. To this day there are virtually no Indians in the Free State.

The population of the Union at the last census, in 1946, was :

	<i>Natal</i>	<i>Transvaal*</i>	<i>Cape</i>	<i>OFS</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>% of Total</i>
Indians	228,119	37,505	16,901	14	282,539†	2.5
Europeans	232,923				2,335,460	20.8
Coloureds					905,050	8.0
Natives					7,735,809	68.7
					11,258,539	100

Although in the whole population they are only 2.5 per cent., owing to their history and the later restrictions on their inter-provincial movement, 80 per cent. of the Indians are concentrated in Natal, where they nearly equal the European population—and 54 per cent. of the Natal Europeans and 50 per cent. of the Indians live in Durban. These areas of special density, and the fact that the Transvaal Indian community almost entirely derive from the Gujerati free immigrants

* About half in Johannesburg.

† The mid-1950 estimates gave a total of approx. 323,000.

and therefore have a wealth level well above the average for the whole Indian population, must be remembered when studying figures for the country as a whole. As long ago as 1932 it was estimated that 80 per cent. of the Indians had been born in South Africa and the proportion must be nearer 90 per cent. to-day.

The economic depression of the mid-eighties saw the first outburst of European antipathy to the Indians, whose economic competition was feared. As soon as Natal received self-government in 1893, it imposed an annual poll-tax on all Indians who had completed their indentures—the purpose being to encourage them to return to India. In 1897 free immigration was restricted. Meanwhile the Free State had ejected its Indians and in 1906 the Cape prohibited the entry of Asiatics who could not pass a writing test (a device for stopping immigration similar to that employed by Australia to-day). In 1907 the Transvaal, which in 1903 had made the entry of Indians subject to permit, ordered all Asiatic residents to register and record their finger-prints in order to curb the illegal entry of Indians claiming previous residence—though the scale on which this was occurring was as much the fault of the corrupt immigration staff as of the ingenuity and persistence of the Indians. However, for the first and almost the last time in its turbulent history the Indian community was really united behind a great leader and against these regulations Gandhi led the first campaign of that form of passive resistance which we came to know so well in India as *satyagraha*. The campaign culminated in the Indian General Strike of 1913 and the Smuts-Gandhi Agreement of the following year. Under it the £3 poll-tax in Natal was abolished and marriages according to Indian rites were recognized in law. The various immigration regulations of the four provinces were consolidated in the Immigrants Regulation Act (1913), which effectively prohibited Indian immigration altogether and the inter-provincial movement of Indians but did not single out Asiatics or Indians by name—a fact that meant much to sensitive Indian feelings. The Act is still in force.

There is no doubt that General Smuts, who retained a lasting respect for Gandhi, intended that this agreement, by removing the Europeans' fear of being swamped by Indian immigration, should open the way for a more liberal treatment of the resident Indian population. But the Nationalist Government of 1923 showed that he had under-estimated the stubbornness of racial prejudice. Dr. Malan in introducing a punitively segregational Bill, said in 1924 : "The Bill frankly starts from the general supposition that the Indian as a race in this country is an alien element in the population and that no solution of the question will be acceptable to the country unless it results in a very considerable reduction of the Indian population in this country." He and his followers have consistently said the same

ever since. After the intervention of the Government of India and a Round Table Conference the Bill was dropped under the Cape Town Agreement of 1927 in return for the Indian Government's recognition of the Union Government's right to maintain western standards of life and their co-operation in working a scheme for voluntary repatriation. "The whole object of the agreement is to get as many Indians repatriated as possible," said Dr. Malan ; but in the next five years only 10,738 returned permanently to India. The second Cape Town Agreement of 1932 admitted that repatriation had failed because 80 per cent. of the South African Indians had been born in the Union. Since then repatriation, although it has remained the nominal policy of both the main political parties, has been dead as a practical programme, short of compulsion which no-one has yet suggested. The fact is that not only are most of the Indians Union-born, but they know that for all their troubles they are economically better off than they would be in an India in which they have no economic roots. There is certainly some disguised compulsion in the economic and social legislation of recent years but, having survived so much discriminatory treatment and increased their numbers without the assistance of immigration, it is not likely that discriminatory measures alone will force them to emigrate.

Discrimination against the Indians, as against the other coloured races, is made possible by their lack of effective representation. In the Free State and Transvaal the vote has always been reserved for the white population alone. In the Cape the Indians have always had the same franchise rights as the Coloured community. In Natal, before self-government, Indians had the vote subject to certain property and educational qualifications. In 1896, however, (when there were 9,309 European and 251 Indian electors on the register) Indians were disfranchised by an Act withholding the vote from "natives of countries which have not hitherto possessed elective representative institutions." In 1924 the municipal franchise in Natal was limited to those who qualified for the parliamentary vote and so Indians, except those already registered, lost the municipal vote as well. In some respects this means more personal and social hardship than the lack of political representation, since they are a small minority in the country as a whole but a considerable element in many urban areas. For, as the Broome Commission of 1944 said : "The civic purse is not bottomless, and of the many calls made upon it some must be refused or postponed. Refusal or postponement is perhaps less likely if the consequent disappointment can be expressed through the ballot box." A Natal member of General Smuts's last cabinet said : "If Durban had shown a sense of responsibility and tried to tackle the housing problem in so far as it affected the Indians, there would have been no Indian problem in Durban to-day." As

part of the Cape Town Agreement of 1927 the Union Government admitted responsibility for the welfare and development of the Indian community and the fact that so little has been done to implement that admission is largely due to the lack of Indian representation in national or municipal affairs.

There was a move to restore a limited municipal franchise in 1944 but a referendum of the white municipal electorate defeated it by a large majority. In 1946, as part (and not a very honest part, since General Smuts had been warned by the Broome Commission that the Indians would not accept communal representation) of a measure to restrict Indian purchase and occupation of land, the Indians were given the right to be represented by two Europeans in the Senate, three in the House of Assembly and two (who might be Indians) in the Natal Provincial Council. Condemning the property clauses of the Act as ghetto-creating, the Indians boycotted this limited franchise completely and the first act of the Malan Government in 1948 was to repeal it (while leaving the property clauses intact). Indians have always (and reasonably) made it clear that, while they will accept a franchise on the common roll subject to qualifications (thus meeting European fears of being swamped in certain areas—European franchise being universal), they will not accept communal representation on a separate roll. The history of the Native Representatives since 1936 and the motives behind the recent removal of the Cape Coloureds on to a separate roll substantiate the Indian contention that a small say in several constituencies is far more effective than monopoly of one or two for safeguarding and promoting their interests.

The third main group of restrictions to which the Indians are subject concerns trade, residence and the occupation of land, and constitutes the most damaging of their disabilities. The history of the legislation attempting to segregate the Indians residentially and commercially and to curtail their economic competition by a licensing system is so complicated and the result of the most recent Act so uncertain as yet that here can only be summarized the present position, which has resulted from the dissemination throughout the Union of the illiberal policies of the old Boer republics. The early segregatory laws were badly framed and ineffectively administered so that Indians circumvented them by various devices. Much of the later legislation ought to close existing loopholes, and the whole position was consolidated in the Asiatic Land Tenure and Indian Representation Act of 1946. The property clauses prohibited the sale of land, except in certain exempted areas, between Europeans and Asiatics in the Transvaal and Natal unless under permit from the Minister of the Interior. Nor might Indians occupy property (unless they were already in occupation when the Act came into force) in areas where

they might not purchase it—and the trade licensing laws restrict Indian trading to areas where they may legitimately occupy land.

While Indians unanimously opposed this "Ghettos Act", and many went to prison for passively resisting it (and the Government of India broke off trade relations and withdrew its High Commissioner), the Director of the Institute of Race Relations made the following trenchant criticisms :

(1) Experience has shown that the possible advantages of social separation, such as group solidarity making for self-respect and social progress, have always been offset by denial of the elementary rights of decent housing, sanitation and amenities generally, so that segregation, or separation, has become synonymous with inferior treatment, if not neglect. (2) The Bill does not face squarely the problem of social separation, for the areas exempted from the restrictions against Asiatics, that is, the areas in which Asiatics may live, will also be the areas in which Europeans and other races may live. The main effect of the Bill will be to raise enormously the cost of land, housing and other amenities in these areas. (3) We look in vain in this Bill for the equality of sacrifice of which the Prime Minister speaks. What do the Europeans of the Transvaal and Natal sacrifice? Can it be claimed that the grant of the restricted franchise is to be measured against the withdrawal in Natal of the Indians' present unrestricted right to live, own land and invest their savings in property? (*South Africa Faces U.N.O.* (1947) p. 13-14)

The latest legislation in this class, the Group Areas Act of 1950, apparently meets the second of these criticisms, since it purports to segregate each racial group, including the Europeans. But it is open to the serious objections that it extends residential and commercial distinctions to the Cape (where none previously existed) and that it clearly does not safeguard (as all previous legislation did) already established rights in whatever "area" they may fall. Furthermore one may well doubt that any racial group in the world could be trusted to administer such a measure in the just interests of other other groups in the same society equally with its own, and it is the virtual certainty (based on a long history of discrimination in favour of the European) that the measure will be selectively administered.

This whole question of the social and commercial segregation of different racial groups raises most difficult issues. Few friends of the Indians would claim that cleanliness and quietness are their most prominent virtues, though whether it is just to segregate all Indians because of some individual failings in these respects is quite another matter, especially in view of all the other motives involved. Of these where prejudice is not merely emotional, fear of economic competition is the most persistent factor. In the debate on the Smuts-Gandhi Agreement, Mr. C. G. Fichardt said : "When Europeans and Asiatics come together, the Europeans invariably go to the wall." In the budget debate of 1929 Mr. Anderson asked the Minister of the Interior : "Whether under this voluntary repatriation scheme (the Cape Town Agreement of 1927) any of the Indian trading classes, or the classes who perform skilled work, have taken advantage of the

scheme ? If this agreement is not going to touch these classes, it is no solution of the Asiatic problem."

Yet in 1921 the Lange Commission reported : "In the Transvaal the evidence and statistics should go far to remove the misconception and allay the ill-founded alarm prevailing among some sections of the community regarding the 'Asiatic menace'." The Young Commission reported in 1934 : "It is clear that the avenues of Indian employment are gradually closing. In all unskilled occupations the Indian is giving place to the Native. In the semi-skilled and better paid occupations there has been no expansion of Indian employment nor, owing to the white labour policy, is there any immediate prospect of further expansion." The Broome Commission of 1940 reported : "The Indian penetration (of European areas) in Natal does not appear to be serious if the total number of cases is considered in relation to the population." To which Mr. J. Fyfe replied in the Durban City Council : "The Broome Commission showed that there were 570-odd cases of penetration in Durban and I am quite prepared to say that that is penetration, even if the Commission is not prepared to say so." Srinavasa Sastri, the first Indian Agent-General in the Union, truly commented : "White people in South Africa reject the testimony of facts without hesitation." On this subject, about which South Africans feel so strongly, the writer deliberately chooses to quote South Africans. In a campaign against discriminatory legislation in 1939, which caused his expulsion from the caucus of his party, Hofmeyr wrote : "The Asiatics fear segregation because to them it means economic strangulation. The Asiatic community in the Transvaal consists mainly of traders and, apart from trade, the economic opportunities available to them are considerably restricted. At the back of the segregation agitation trade rivalry is a very important factor. For all too many South Africans the motive in supporting segregation is that of self-interest." There is an obvious parallel with anti-Semitism. As a former President of the Institute of Race Relations wrote recently : "Anti-Semitism in Europe is so like anti-Indian feeling in Natal that it would be possible for any Natalian to advance all the arguments of the anti-Semite without ever having seen a Jew."*

Anti-Indian feeling in South Africa is primarily among the Europeans. It is said by some who dislike the Indians that the Natives are equally antipathetic to them and episodes like the Durban riots of January 13-16, 1949† are quoted to support the view. It is of

* *South Africa Faces UNO*, p. 28.

† Excited by a trivial incident, large numbers of Natives attacked the Indians, killing over 50 and injuring more than 500. Some 90 Natives were killed and over 550 injured, mostly by the police. These figures only account for *ascertained* casualties. More than 700 stores and 1,500 dwellings (mostly Indian) were destroyed or damaged and many poor Indian households lost all they possessed. The most probable causes of the riots were (a) accumulated resentment at the rising cost of foodstuffs which Natives ordinarily buy at Indian stores ; (b) jealousy of certain Indian advantages (as against

course true that individual Indians have mulcted their Native customers and that others have been guilty of adopting an attitude of racial superiority little less arrogant than that of many Europeans. On the other hand Natives are usually treated in Indian stores with a courtesy and patience not often shown them in European-owned shops and, if the Indian proprietor follows the oriental custom of quoting too high a price and then slowly reducing it to secure a sale, it is a procedure which leaves both parties satisfied that they have driven a good bargain.

When considering the present status of the South African Indian, one sees that, like the other coloured races, he is subject to regulations designed to preserve the European monopoly of skilled labour and that, in common with other non-Europeans, he receives a considerably smaller proportionate share of social welfare benefits than does the European. To catalogue such disabilities and the various social and administrative implications of the colour bar would be tedious. The stigma of inferior status naturally bears most heavily upon a very sensitive people with a long tradition of culture and civilization behind them—such as the other non-Europeans have not yet got.

Turning to their economic status, we see a fairly prosperous commercial community in the Transvaal, whose security of tenure is in jeopardy. In Natal there are great discrepancies between a small number of very wealthy Indian merchants and industrialists and a large mass of very poor labourers, small holders and petty traders. The industrial census of 1936 gave the percentages (to nearest thousand) of Indians in various employments thus :

	Total	%	% of all races
Farming, forestry, fishing	18	28.1	0.5
Commerce and finance	18	28.1	11.4
Manufacturing	11	17.2	4.4
Domestic and hotel service	7	10.9	1.5
Public service, professions	4	6.3	2.4
Transport	3	4.7	1.6
Mining	1	1.6	0.6
Miscellaneous	2	3.1	2.1
	64	100	1.2

The size of families being governed not only by the number of children, but by the custom, especially among Asiatics, of several generations living together as a joint family, the result of a one in two sample survey of Indian family incomes in 1945-1946 in seven rural

the Natives) in such matters as trading licences and freedom from passes ; (c) provocation of the anti-Indian speeches of Europeans (notably in the Nationalist election campaign of 1948) ; (d) the belief that because of his weakness and the attitude of the Europeans (some actually cheered the rioters on) the Indian could be attacked with impunity. The background is the appalling slum conditions in which most of the Durban Indians and Natives live, and the frustration which all the coloured races feel at the lack of opportunities for social and economic advancement.

towns show this :

	<i>Average size of family</i>	<i>Average family income p.a.</i>	<i>Net per Capita income p.a.</i>
Europeans	3.39	£529	£156
Asiatics	6.96	£269	£39 *
Coloureds	4.28	£143	£33
Natives	3.96	£85	£21

In an economic survey in 1943-1944 the Economic Department of Natal University College estimated that 71 per cent. of the Durban Indian community (which is half of the Natal Indian population) lives below the poverty line†—as against 5 per cent. of the Europeans, 38 per cent. of the Coloureds and a quarter of the Natives. According to the Municipal Housing Regulations, 42 per cent. of the Indians live in overcrowded conditions (34 per cent. living in one room per family), against 5 per cent. of the Europeans, 24 per cent. of the Coloureds and 39 per cent. of the Natives. Eighty-one per cent. of the Indian houses and 23 per cent. of the European houses were of wood and iron. To remove these conditions 2,800 new houses were then required for Indians, 1,620 for Natives, 520 for Europeans and 200 for Coloureds.‡ Another 1,400 new houses are wanted annually to meet the natural increase of the Asiatic population. Owing to lack of facilities 40 per cent. of the Natal Indian children of school-going age are not at school and many do not receive education beyond the infant classes (only 13 per cent. reach Standard IV). There are far too few vacancies for Indians at the universities and technical colleges. Thus basically the Indian problem in Natal is one of poverty with the industrial colour bar as its chief contributory cause. The proof of poverty is further evidenced in the figures for the incidence of tuberculosis—the Indian rate being five times the European—and in the fact that out of 1,442 Indians medically examined at a survey in 1946 in the Durban district of Springfield, 1,255 were found to be seriously undernourished.

It will have been seen from the first table that between 1931 and 1936 the European population of Natal overhauled and passed the Indian population again ; but that between 1936 and 1946 the Indians were once more closing the gap.¶ There is no doubt that the Indian has the highest fertility rate of the four racial groups. In 1936, 47 per cent. of the Indians and only 27 per cent. of the Europeans were under 15 years of age and in 1943 the excess of Indian births over deaths was about $25\frac{1}{2}$ per thousand as against the European figure of

* Among the Durban labouring class alone this figure was only about £21.

† A minimum standard of living was assumed for each community, according to customs, diet, etc.

‡ The Europeans formed 35% of the population of Durban, the Indians 32% and the Natives the bulk of the remainder.

¶ White immigration and an adverse masculinity rate of 152 Indian males to 100 females when Asiatic immigration ceased in 1911 were the chief factors. The former has now virtually ceased and the latter had fallen to 112 in 1936.

16½. While the Indian is the most prolific, all the coloured races significantly outbreed the European and it is therefore obvious that without large-scale white immigration (which the present Government discountenance in order to preserve the voting majority of the Afrikaner people) the percentage of Europeans in the total population is falling and will fall even more rapidly as better health and welfare provisions for the coloured races reduce their abnormally high mortality rates. This and the concentration of Indians in Natal* (and particularly in Durban) must be taken into account when considering European fears of being swamped by the coloured races, which (as far as the Indians are concerned) seem unreasonable in the light of figures for the whole country.

Every year at the General Assembly of the United Nations the Government of India indicts the South African Government for their treatment of the Indian population. But the time has come for Pandit Nehru to ask himself whether he does in fact further the welfare of the Union's Indian community by this sort of diplomatic bludgeoning. For the first two years (1946-1947) the UN debate certainly drew the attention of the world to South Africa's policy of racial discrimination ; but the Nationalist Government, which succeeded that of General Smuts in 1948, has by their own aggressively racialistic measures made it unnecessary for others to stimulate world opinion on the subject. Those South Africans who are open to the suggestion, are already well aware that their racial policies have significance beyond their own country. Those whose minds are closed are only further angered and convinced by criticism (much of it ill-informed and coming from countries with notorious social and economic injustices of their own) that the treatment of their coloured races is a purely domestic affair. The task of those who seek to convert the majority of their white fellow-countrymen to a more liberal attitude towards the non-European races is not made easier when they are made to seem the accomplices of foreign Governments pillorying their own country ; and this misrepresentation can only give gratuitous assistance to the electoral campaign of the party most uncompromisingly committed to South Africa's traditional racial policy.

(The author, a Foundation Scholar in history at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, was Under-Secretary to the Government of Punjab's Political Department from 1944 to 1945 ; he now lives in South Africa for reasons of health.)

* The mid-1950 estimates of 261,000 Indians against 268,000 Europeans suggest that the Indians may outnumber the Europeans in Natal in the 1951 census.

BRITAIN AND THE RISE OF ARAB NATIONALISM

BY NEVILL BARBOUR

IN the two centuries which followed the establishment of Islam, the Arabs spread their faith, language and rule from Baghdad in the east to Marrakesh and Toledo in the west. The memory of former Arab administrative eminence is still embodied in the languages of Europe in such terms as "admiral", "arsenal" and "tariff". But, by the beginning of the nineteenth century, all Arabs, except those of Morocco and some parts of Arabia proper, were subject to Turkish rule. Arab nationality had been swallowed up in religion ; nobody thought of the Arabic-speaking peoples as an actual or potential political entity. Meanwhile, the growing weakness of the Ottoman Empire was giving rise to the problem of who was to succeed to control of the Arab provinces, Syria, Iraq, Jerusalem with the Holy Land, Egypt, Cyrenaica, Tripoli, Tunis, and Algeria. The principal claimants were France and England. English attention was concentrated on the routes to India : Egypt which lay on the direct path ; Syria, starting point of the route from Aleppo through Baghdad and Basra to Karachi, and, in the extreme west, Morocco (which was, however, an independent State) whose Atlantic coast faced the sea route to the east. French hopes were directed to Egypt ; to Syria, where a shadowy French connection had persisted since the time of the Crusades, and to North Africa, where France, now the principal representative of Latin civilization, could claim to be the heir of Rome. In the Holy Land, Russia also came into the picture ; she established herself as protector of Orthodox Christianity, invested large sums in religious and educational establishments and began to subsidize a vast annual pilgrimage of her subjects to Jerusalem. France assumed protection of the Latin Christians while Britain, not content with partnering Prussia in protection of the limited number of Protestants, set herself up, on Lord Palmerston's initiative, as protector of Jewry. This action was a factor leading eventually to British sponsorship of that Jewish National Home which the Mandatory Government then reluctantly watched growing into the State of Israel, to the great prejudice of British relations with the Arabs ; while the patronage of Jewry and Israel, with whatever advantages and disadvantages it may bring, passed to the U.S.A. Of other European powers, Portugal had

retired in 1769 when she abandoned Mazagan, her last possession in Morocco. Spain was in no condition to undertake a major adventure, but her history and position made it certain that she would continue to play some part in the affairs of North Africa. Italy, heir of Venice, Genoa, Pisa, and Amalfi, was taken up with internal problems until 1911, when she invaded Libya. The gestures made by another latecomer, Germany, in sending the Emperor William II to Damascus in 1898 and to Tangier in 1905 failed to win her a position in the Arab world. France and England were therefore the chief beneficiaries.

The former began the conquest of Algeria in 1827, took Tunis in 1881 and Morocco (less the Riff zone which she yielded to Spain) in 1912, and received a mandate over Syria and the Lebanon in 1923. England occupied Egypt in 1882 and received mandates for Iraq and Palestine, including Transjordan, in 1923. As Italy had just gone into Libya when France occupied Morocco, the apportionment of the Arab world amongst the European powers was completed in the century from 1827-1923. Even before this consummation however there were signs that the process would be reversed and the rights of the Arab people to some degree of autonomy be increasingly recognized. It is true that Libya was taken by military conquest ; this unseasonable aggression however brought rapid retribution. Elsewhere the forms of local sovereignty were increasingly respected until, at the end of the 1914-1918 war, authority was only assumed under the form of mandates from the League of Nations ; these clearly envisaged the ultimate independence of countries under temporary European control. Meanwhile, a feeling of national solidarity had begun to arise amongst the Arabs themselves. The possibility of Arab nationalism had been foreseen by Ibrahim Pasha, the son and general of Muhammed Ali, founder of the present Egyptian dynasty, as early as 1833 when he announced to a French observer " his intention of reviving Arab nationality . . . and of making them into a self-reliant people." Contemporary Egyptian conquests did in fact for a short while unite Syria, Arabia, and the Sudan with Egypt and form the nucleus of an Arab empire, the memory of which probably influences Egyptian outlook in the Arab League to-day. In 1882, a French traveller, Denys de Rivoyre, called attention to the signs of incipient nationalism throughout the Arab world and urged his countrymen to take it into consideration at once, lest the opportunity should be missed and seized by the British. In the beginning of the twentieth century the idea of an Arab nation began to be openly expressed by Syrian and Iraqi intellectuals and leaders. On the outbreak of the 1914-1918 war Lord Kitchener gave instructions for an approach to be made to the Sherif Hussain of Mecca, as the possible leader of an Arab revolt against the Turks. The subsequent negotiations, recorded in the " Hussain-

MacMahon Correspondence" have attracted so much attention in connection with the Palestine question as to obscure their wider significance as the occasion on which the British Government, not really intending to do more than favour Arab self-government in the Hejaz and Arabia, committed itself to a vague support of the idea of Arab independence and unity in general. Though the Arab nation then envisaged, even by Arabs, included only Syria, Iraq and Arabia proper, it was inevitable that Egypt, as the centre of Arabic culture, would be drawn in and play a part corresponding to her importance in the area, and that it should in the end involve North Africa also. In 1936 H.M.G. went a step further by invoking the services of the Arab kings to bring about a truce in Palestine and, a little later, by inviting to London representatives of the independent Arab States, including Egypt, to discuss the whole question of Jewish-Arab relations. British approval of the principle of Arab unity was finally given in a statement issued by Mr. Eden in 1941 : "It seems to me both natural and right that the cultural and economic ties between the Arab countries, and the political ties too, should be strengthened. His Majesty's Government will give full support to any scheme that commands general approval." This "*nihil obstat*" was followed in 1945 by the formation of the Arab League.

The immediate purpose of the declaration was to win Arab support in the war and to counter Nazi propaganda which was fiercely attacking Britain as the enemy of Arab unity. No doubt it was felt also to be a logical development, consistent with British as well as Arab interests. There can in fact be no doubt that it did win Arab good will. This was confirmed by the energetic action which was taken, largely owing to the resolution of Sir Edward Spears, then Minister to the Levant States, to ensure that the promise of independence made to Syria and the Lebanon should be implemented, even at the risk of serious prejudice to British relations with France. On the other hand, the Arab League has disappointed British hopes by concentrating on large and thorny external political issues while neglecting to promote Arab internal development which would have done much to raise Arab prestige at the United Nations and in face of the world in general. Political relations between Arab States have remained strained ; little has been achieved in promoting economic development and integration on an inter-Arab level and the League has even failed to persuade the Arab States to abolish the formality of visas for one another's nationals. It would, however, be a great mistake to underrate the close contact brought about by its regular meetings and the strength of family feeling engendered by public recognition of common aims and common misfortunes. In other fields, too, modern transport, broadcasting and the multiplication of international bodies are giving the various parts of the Arab

world a much more intimate knowledge of one another than they ever possessed before. A further unifying factor has been the dispersal of educated Palestinians and their employment in official and other capacities in the various States. The result is now a common dominating sentiment in favour of completing the independence of the Arab territories, of maintaining their integrity, of co-ordinating their foreign policy and defence, of containing Israel and, if possible, of regaining Palestine for her former Arab inhabitants. There does not appear to be any considerable desire on the part of the Arab leaders to deal at once with the problem of forming a larger political unit which they might perhaps find it difficult to administer. On the other hand, any action taken by an outsider which appears to render the general Arab aims more difficult of achievement is liable to provoke a violent agitation in all Arab countries. This happened for years over Zionism and in recent days there has been a similar example in connection with Morocco. These common objectives, which no individual Arab dare disown, are however not being pursued by a homogeneous body, but through a number of separate States ; these press their own claims at the expense of the general interest and frequently intrigue against one another, on account of dynastic and other local jealousies. This means that British relations with the Arabs are extremely complex. On the one hand, there is a great deal of mutual comprehension and co-operation ; but on the other a full and friendly alliance is ruled out by a number of disagreements which (with the exception of the problem of the Sudan) are all connected either with the defence bases which England finds it necessary to maintain in the Arab world or with the consequences of the establishment of the State of Israel. The former issue wrecked the proposed Treaty of Portsmouth with Iraq and the Suez Canal base is a constant bone of contention with Egypt. The disagreement with the Arab League over Libya, where Britain favours a Federal government for the three territories, Cyrenaica, Tripoli and Fezzan, while the League prefers a unitary government in Tripoli, has its origin mainly in League suspicion of possible British influence and bases in Cyrenaica. Even in Jordan, the existence of British elements which have the whole-hearted approval of the local government gives rise to suspicion in the minds of Jordan's neighbours, Syria and Egypt ; Arabs ask why Britain who has not insisted on retaining bases in independent India and Pakistan should do so in this case. Such a question overlooks the fact that India and Pakistan are members of the Commonwealth, with all the implications which that carries in the sphere of mutual assistance, and that the two States have much more powerful means of self-defence than the Arabs possess. England could not risk the oil of the Middle East falling into enemy hands or of the Suez Canal area being used as a base for operations against the

Commonwealth. Egypt's excellent communications, her agricultural wealth, her abundant manpower, and her position make her an incomparable centre for operations directed by sea to east or west or by land to Asia or Africa. It might have been hoped that the Arab States would collectively regard British bases in their territories less as an infringement of Arab independence than as a guarantee of Arab security. King Abdullah and probably the Emir Idris do hold this view, but in the case of the Arabs as a whole the position is analogous to that of Eire, both with regard to long standing grievances against a former ruling power and to what they consider the loss of a portion of their national territory. Britain has in fact to pay now for the Jewish aid which she sought in the 1914-1918 war; for the Balfour Declaration meant in the end, as the Arabs always claimed that it would, that an Arab province was occupied by strangers and that three-quarters of a million Arabs were condemned to exile, many of them in actual sight of the houses and fields which are being occupied or ploughed by those who dispossessed their owners.

In the circumstances it is too much to expect that British bases will be welcomed, but it is still possible to hope that they will be tolerated. Feeling the need for support, though unwilling to admit it, Arab pride may prefer to accept the bases under protest rather than freely negotiate long term treaties. This may not be statesmanlike but it is a natural reaction and seems a possible explanation of the Iraqi refusal to replace the existing Anglo-Iraqi Treaty by the more favourable but longer-term Treaty of Portsmouth. The government in power at the time were confident that they could secure ratification by Parliament, but were defeated by a factious opposition playing on the sentiment of nationalism. The fact that Syria and the Lebanon had recently achieved independence without the necessity of accepting foreign bases may have contributed to this result.

Disagreement is most serious in the case of Egypt where it leads to fractious and irritating hostility in unrelated spheres and is accompanied by violent press and wireless attacks on British policy which are capable of leading to a crisis. In this case the problem of the Sudan is a further complication, though it is a specifically Egyptian rather than a general Arab issue. Since the Sudan is in any case developing into an Arab State, it is of little importance to Arabs outside Egypt whether it is associated with them as a separate State or as a federated or integral portion of Egypt. But even if, in private, Arab leaders exert a moderating influence, Arab solidarity compels them to support Egypt in public. The logical as opposed to theotional basis of the Egyptian viewpoint on the Sudan is suspicion that Britain is deliberately setting the Sudanese against her. No British purpose would in fact be served by such an action and it is

certainly right to encourage good relations between the two Nile Valley countries, while making it clear that, if there are difficulties, these arise from differences of opinion between Egyptians and Sudanese, not between Egyptians and British. Success was in fact nearly reached in the Anglo-Egyptian negotiations in 1946 ; with patience, magnanimity and determination it may be achieved yet. A further source of ill-feeling between Britain and Egypt is the Egyptian refusal to allow tankers to carry oil to Israel through the Suez Canal. Troublesome as this is, it is not quite certain that Egypt is not within her rights in the matter, and the putting out of action of the Haifa refinery was a risk which was taken when Britain abstained from giving a lead on the Palestine question at United Nations. To the Arabs, the issue is fundamental and when we complain of the loss of refining capacity to Europe, it has to be remembered that Iraq, by cutting off the supply of oil, is herself sacrificing millions of pounds annually on top of the expense of the Jewish war. It is hard to see that any purpose would be served by an emotional reaction to the issue and by refusing arms which we are bound by treaty obligations to supply ; they are in fact a consideration in return for which we have the right to maintain troops in Arab countries.

The most dangerous issue arising from the Palestine tragedy is the Arab-Israeli hostility ; to this no end is in sight. The continued ineffectiveness of the Security Council in the matter gives no cause for confidence. More hope is to be placed on the Three Power Declaration by the United Kingdom, United States and France ; this, by guaranteeing existing frontiers, limits the possibility of aggression.

Internally Communism does not seem to be a substantial menace in the Arab countries ; in this respect, at least, Arab governments act with decision. Nor will the Arab States have any desire, or indeed opportunity, to be other than on the western side in case of war, though this may not prevent them from occasionally using the suggestion in order to gain some new concession from the west.

Arab desire for Anglo-Saxon support in seeking to persuade the French to adopt in North Africa a policy analogous to British policy towards the Arabs in the Middle East is likely to prove embarrassing, but not to raise a major problem for this country. It is rather the United States, with her recently established bases in North Africa, who are likely to be deeply involved ; the British rôle will probably be confined to urging moderation.

When Anglo-Arab relations are thus regarded as a whole and in the setting of history, there are seen to be many favourable as well as some unfavourable features. While in the nineteenth century Britain was one of several European countries competing for position in the eastern Arab world, her prestige there to-day is incomparably

greater than that of any other European power and her influence is based on esteem for her moral qualities and social progress as much as on respect for her power. Much criticism was levelled at Mr. Ernest Bevin for his handling of Middle Eastern affairs during the years which followed the end of the war ; yet it appears chiefly due to his unruffled determination and refusal to be diverted from a well-established line of policy that the position to-day is as favourable as it is. In Palestine, he inherited an intolerable position for which the responsibility was in no way his. In the face of unprecedented difficulties and a babel of conflicting counsel, he extricated His Majesty's Government in circumstances which have enabled the Israelis to be rapidly reconciled with this country, if not with his own memory, and though he was Foreign Minister at the moment when the disaster which the Arabs had always anticipated from the Balfour Declaration at last befell them, he was the first British statesman ever to be eulogized by Arab leaders after his death as a friend of their nation. The solution was tragic, but no-one has suggested any means by which a less painful issue could have been found. The treaties which he endeavoured to negotiate with Iraq and Egypt were not concluded, but it was surely better to have deserved success and for the moment failed rather than to let things drift. He set his heart also on raising the standard of living in the Middle East ; this is a project which is difficult of realization, but it was surely worth initiating. As social conditions and education improve in the Arab countries—and they are improving, if slowly—it is reasonable to suppose that political maturity will increase also. It is perhaps not altogether beyond hope that in time Anglo-Arab relations will take the form of an entirely free alliance based on common interest and mutual advantage.

In any survey of Arab affairs, the emergence of Pakistan as an independent and important member of the Commonwealth is a factor which must be taken into consideration. As an essentially Muslim State, Pakistan is certain to express sympathy with Arab and Egyptian aims and to be a powerful advocate in their cause. But at the same time, Pakistan is a member of the Commonwealth and has every interest in a fair settlement of differences between the Muslim world and the United Kingdom. If from a short term point of view her advocacy may sometimes seem inconvenient, it may well turn out that in the long run her influence may reduce dissension between the individual Arab States and between this country and the Arab world as a whole.

(The author has lived thirteen years in the Arab world ; his book *Nisi Dominus* is a discussion of the problems of Palestine.)

ANGLO-CANADIAN TRADE AND THE WHEAT CONTRACT

BY LESLIE BISHOP

THE decisions taken at the recent Torquay conference constitute a clear warning of Canada's dilemma, which we would be wise to heed before it is too late. Canadian opinion varied as to whether the conference will prove to be a turning-point in Anglo-Canadian trade relations. On May 11, the influential Liberal *Winnipeg Free Press* summed up the results as follows :

Apart from the various minor tariff agreements now announced, the Torquay conference foundered on that ancient and stubborn reef, Protectionism. Britain was unwilling to give up any part of its protected position in the Commonwealth and sterling areas. Countries like Australia, New Zealand and South Africa were unwilling to give up similar advantages in the British market. All these countries clung to their narrow Commonwealth and sterling areas rather than risk greater competition in the world market, and especially in the markets of North America. Under the current circumstances of British politics nothing else perhaps could have been expected. The Labour Government is wedded, by socialist ideology, to protectionism, trade discrimination and strict State control of the movement of all goods. The Conservative opposition, while opposed to socialism, is even more protectionist than the Government and still more deeply entrenched in a preferential tariff system which apparently is regarded as a closed British or sterling trading bloc. Events will demonstrate that the cost of maintaining this closed bloc is very high. Sooner or later the folly of confining their trade to the narrow sterling zone will become evident to the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa and the sterling countries generally. They will come to see that in trying to maintain the spirit if not the letter of Joseph Chamberlain's idea of an Empire or sterling Zollverein or customs union, they are attempting vainly to turn back the hands of the clock while time moves inexorably on.

As for Canada, it has shown at Torquay its determination to avoid imprisonment in this Preference cage. It has held wisely to the original conception of the Laurier government in launching the British Preference. It was done to reduce not increase tariffs.

Thus Canada has negotiated an agreement with the United States which will increase somewhat the flow of goods across the friendly border. This is to the good, but the St. Laurent government did not go far enough. Now that Canada's trade—the largest *per capita* in history—is so heavily concentrated in the United States market, now that the hope of expanding trade with the sterling area has been diminished if not blocked altogether by the attitude of the U.K. and other Commonwealth countries at Torquay, and now that the Canadian tariff is a major factor in our high cost of living, the Government should seek a much larger trade agreement with Washington. We should seek still wider United States markets and, by reducing our own tariff, should reduce the price of many goods which are priced

far too high now simply because they are protected from any real competition. he *Montreal Gazette* commented that the Torquay results were hardly worth hosannas". The *Ottawa Citizen* observed wistfully that

Torquay . . . may mark the fork in the road at which Canada must veer away from the Commonwealth preference system (which has been largely a Canadian invention) and move towards a partnership with the United States in a broader system of relatively freer trade. Such a system has its hazards, the most obvious being the fluctuations of American policy between enlightened self-interest and fits of isolationism that threaten destruction of self and friends. If Britain and the Commonwealth, ex-Canada, are unwilling to make significant concessions in preferential tariffs, the price offered by the United States may not be high enough. The United States is hesitant and fumbling in the face of the obvious and logical step of establishing the principles of the International Trade Organization, as the basis of American policy and the basic assurance to other nations that Congress has really reformed and put away the toys of economic warfare that delighted it so much in its childhood. It must remain the task of Canadian statesmanship to bring the American and Commonwealth commercial systems together.

Canada has not yet, by any means, abandoned the British preference system. One factor militating against her doing so is the apparent reluctance of the United States Congress to enlarge the president's tariff-reducing powers. In the words of a Toronto writer, she is "staying within the Commonwealth economic sphere as much as contiguity with the United States and artificial checks to commerce will let her." She continues to give preferential concessions on the Canadian market, as negotiated at Ottawa in 1932, notwithstanding the fact that import quotas and restrictions against dollar goods make it almost impossible to sell Canadian manufactures in other Empire countries.

Nevertheless, she has considerably modified her commitment in successive trade negotiations in recent years. Forty-seven British preference rates were abolished at Torquay. That was in addition to the 90 struck out at Geneva, bringing the total number eliminated to 137. Further, 206 other British preference tariffs were shaved down. But more than 1,000 trade items among the Commonwealth nations remain under preferential rates.

Canada has played the game according to the rules but sees herself as having been penalized by them. More than any other member of the Commonwealth she has felt the weight of the dollar-saving handicap. In order to understand why she feels as she does, we must glance beyond the terse correctness of official statements at the Canadian background. No country in the world has sounder long-term prospects than Canada. She has a gilt-edged future, secured by vast deposits of mineral wealth, but her present situation is very difficult. She has not yet tapped that mineral wealth to such an extent as would make her self-sufficient, even supposing such a thing

were possible. She remains heavily dependent on her export trade, which has been adversely affected by the restrictions on purchase of dollar goods ruling not only in Britain itself but also in the other sterling-currency areas of the Commonwealth. For instance in the case of Canada's trade with the West Indies, the restriction on dollar imports has transformed what was a big favourable balance for Canada a few years ago into a deficit of about \$30 million last year.

Under the Chancellorship of Sir Stafford Cripps Britain's guiding principle in her trade policy towards Canada was that this trade, should be brought into balance, as far as possible. No doubt, such a policy was justified in the days of acute dollar shortage—whether its continuance now is desirable, in view of the great improvement in our foreign exchange reserves, is another question. At all events, that was the Cripps policy towards Canada—that the historic deficit on Britain's ledger should be wiped out. Through the application of Spartan measures, painful alike to the British consumer and the Canadian producer, the policy has come surprisingly near to success. In 1950, for the first time in years, Canada's favourable trade balance with Britain was of small proportions. According to figures published in the *Financial Post* (Toronto), Canada's exports to Britain in that year amounted to \$470 million ; her imports from Britain to \$404 million. On the other hand, Canada's exports to the United States amounted to \$2,037 million ; her imports from the U.S.A. to \$2,133 million. Canada had come to the unprecedented position of transacting two-thirds of both her export and her import trade with her North American neighbour, rousing the fear in some minds that she was putting too many eggs into one basket. Her favourable balance with Britain had shrunk to \$66 million as against \$398 million in 1949. For the first time since the early 1930's, her international balance of payments showed a deficit. It amounted to \$316 million.

One who has lived on both sides of the Atlantic finds that according to where he stands Britain's trade policy appears different. On this side, he sees people courageously facing up to the need to save dollars. On the Canadian side, it looks at times as though the mother country had forgotten the existence of her overseas children, or had overlooked the necessity for them to earn a living in the world. We demand cheap bread ; the Canadian farmer, in his moments of wishful-thinking, tells over in his mind the dollars he would have had with a higher British payment for his wheat. It is a question of the point of view. The Canadian farmer's wife, who had come to depend on Britain's egg-purchases for her pin-money, has seen them fade away from 86 million dozen eggs in 1946 to nothing. In bacon shipments, it is true, Canada has fallen short of the contract but this is partly, at least, the fault of Britain's food-planners in failing to give sufficient

advance notice of their requirements. It takes time to plant and harvest a crop of grain. It takes longer to raise pigs. Another reason has been that inordinate meat prices have caused Canadians to eat more of their own bacon.

We need not go over the whole catalogue of grievances—the disappointments over Britain's purchases of apples, timber, newsprint and so on. It will perhaps be more interesting to review the most important contract, whose history illustrates the whole course of Anglo-Canadian commerce in this era of inter-government trading. Needless to say, this is the United Kingdom—Canada Wheat Agreement under which, in the four-year period, 1946-1950, Britain bought 631 million bushels of Canadian wheat for a total amount of \$1,089,889,013. It has been the biggest bone of contention of them all. Sir Stafford Cripps said in the House of Commons on May 18, 1949 (Hansard Column 562), that "quite obviously" the Wheat Agreement "has been an extremely favourable deal for both countries." The Canadians were not so sure; some of them indeed contending that they had been the losers to the tune of many millions of dollars.

It is fair to note that the Canadian Government initiated discussion of the contract.* According to James H. Gray, a Western correspondent who was in Ottawa at the relevant time:

The whole idea of a long-term agreement arose from the anti-inflation thinking that dominated the Canadian capital in 1944-45-46.

As part of its post-war economic programme, the (Canadian) Government offered the farmers a floor price policy. But the economic thinkers got the jitters about what that floor price could cost when the "certain" collapse of wheat prices came to pass. To avoid that loss, they tried to find somebody to underwrite the floor price. The British agreement eventually came as a result of discussions that sprang from this search for an underwriter.

Farmers recall that, in the spring of 1946, fear of inflation dominated everything that happened in Ottawa. . . . (there was) the fear that wheat prices would start skyrocketing, that they would go up like a rocket and come down like a bomb. So all effort was made to convince the farmers that they would gain at the end of the contract what they lost at the start.

Both Canadian and British Governments appear to have thought

* The following statement by Mr. Gardiner appears on Page 1061 of the Canadian House of Commons Hansard for March 8, 1951: "We initiated the discussions. It was agreed that it would be helpful to Britain to have her main food requirements supplied at a price of \$1.55 a bushel which as then low and was likely to remain low throughout the first two years. The British were confident that the price would fall below \$1.55 in the last two years, and we were just as confident that with United States aid and a Canadian loan the price would go and remain above \$1.55. We, therefore, decided to leave the arrangement of price, as is the case in many British food long-time contracts, to be negotiated.

There is nothing new about that. By far the greater number of British contracts for food has an arrangement in them whereby prices are negotiated for all the years after the first year, and certainly for all the years after the second year. Most of these long-time contracts have a floor and ceiling and are for a price which may be varied a certain percentage upward or a certain percentage downward. That is done by negotiation. There was nothing new about that. The only thing new about this contract as compared with some of the others was the fact that there was no ceiling placed upon the price to which the wheat could go in the last two years. The reason for that will be evident."

that the trend of wheat prices during the four years of the contract would be downward.

They regarded the minimum prices, guaranteed under it, as an insurance for the Canadian farmer against this decline. Instead, as we now know, wheat prices continued to rise. Whether or not they would have continued to rise had there been no bulk contract, is a matter of opinion. We may argue that world food shortage and persistent inflation would have maintained them at high levels. But, of course, it is easy to be wise after the event.

A Canadian critic has described the Anglo-Canadian wheat contract as "Mr. Gardiner's big mistake" in reference to the fact that its chief architect was James G. Gardiner, Canada's Minister of Agriculture for 15 years. He is a remarkable man, whom Britain might well number among her benefactors, if only because he organized an abundant flow of food-stuffs from Canada during the war. He likes to call himself a Saskatchewan farmer and he has derived a measure of statesmanship from long acquaintance with the outward-looking west. An Italian professor's wife, visiting Canada and meeting Mr. Gardiner for the first time, said she thought he had personality enough to be "Prime Minister of the whole British Empire." Diminutive and sturdy, he has a fighter's build, a pleasant face, at once open and inscrutable. The impression, both in private conversation and in public, is one of complete sincerity. No-one who has heard him make a political speech will deny the grasp and lucidity of his mind. His barrage of arguments is almost overwhelming in its first impact. He must have been a good teacher in the early years, before he went into politics. Even to-day, a trace of the schoolmaster lingers, as he hammers out his points before the Canadian House of Commons. He is reported to have said once that, in a controversy, no matter how many people are against you there will always be some who see your point of view. If the Canadian public has failed to see Mr. Gardiner's point of view on the wheat contract, it is certainly not for want of clear exposition.

This spring Ottawa observers were freely predicting that "Jimmy" Gardiner's political career—which had brought him to within an ace of succeeding Mackenzie King as Prime Minister*—was ended at 67 because of the fiasco of the Wheat Agreement. They said he would resign but Jimmy stayed. He got somewhat bothered in face of the accusation that he was trying to make Britain the scapegoat for his own error of judgment, fought verbal battle with two Canadian editors, then attended a baseball match in company with his Cabinet colleague External Affairs Minister "Mike" Pearson, who advised him not to take the editors to

* He was runner-up to Mr. St. Laurent in the choice of Liberal leader.

seriously, and finally withdrew in good order to his farm in Saskatchewan, to hold undisputed sway over his little kingdom of waving grain.

Defending the Wheat Agreement in the Ottawa House on March 8, Mr. Gardiner recalled the fact that there had been an embargo against Canadian wheat going into the United States for human consumption since 1941. How would Canada have sold her wheat, had there been no British contract during those four post-war years ? " If we had left the British market to Marshall aid and attempted to peddle 430 million bushels of wheat over the world under after-the-war conditions, we would have had to give much of it away or lend the dollars to countries which could never pay it back, to get rid of our wheat."

The Searle Grain Company's news-letter answered on April 11 :

Could all our wheat have been sold had it not been for the Agreement ? Most certainly it could have been. During these four years the United States sold on world markets 1,932,000,000 bushels ; Argentina sold 373,000,000 bushels ; Australia 433,000,000 bushels and Canadian Class II wheat 196,000,000 bushels or a total of 2,934,000,000 bushels and all was sold at Class II or better than Class II price. France, India, Turkey and Russia also sold unrevealed additional amounts, again at high prices.

And so the argument continues. As Mr. Gardiner has conceded, Britain discharged her full legal obligations according to the letter of the contract. The only question is whether, in view of all the circumstances, she should not have interpreted it in a more generous spirit and paid a larger sum to compensate Canadian farmers for the fact that Chicago wheat prices remained well above those paid under the contract.

The whole affair deserves to rank as a historic example of the misunderstandings that can arise from unbusinesslike phraseology. At the root of the trouble has been the loosely-worded Clause 2 (b) of the Agreement, which had the effect of raising Canadian hopes that were doomed to disappointment and thus making unnecessary bad blood between the two countries. The clause stated that, in determining the prices to be paid for wheat in the last two years of the contract, the United Kingdom Government would " have regard to " any difference between the prices paid in the first two years and world wheat prices in those years. This was doubly vague. The phrase " have regard to " entailed no obligation. Secondly there is the technical point as to whether or not there was such a thing as a world wheat price in the relevant period. In point of fact, Britain did " have regard to " the price difference, to a certain extent, as Mr. Gardiner has noted. For 1949-1950, the last year of the contract, the United Kingdom paid Canada on 140 million bushels a margin

of approximately 25 cents per bushel above the ceiling price of the International Wheat Agreement. (Again, there are the questions : can the I.W.A. ceiling fairly be called the world price ? What would have happened, had there been no international agreement ?) Mr. Gardiner was prepared to concede that this amounted to a compensation adjustment of "at the outside \$35 million." He contended that it was not enough and, in this contention, many Canadians agreed with him.

In May 1950 Canadian Trade Minister C. D. Howe discussed the final settlement of the contract in London and, on his return to Ottawa, made the following statement (Canadian Hansard, June 5, 1950, page 3221) :

The matter of the have regard to clause was discussed in great detail during our sessions with Sir Stafford Cripps and other ministers of the United Kingdom Government. The whole situation was reviewed. . . . We went over the agreement while in London. We asked the United Kingdom Government what further settlement it is to make on account of the have regard to clause. The United Kingdom Government took a very strong position that they had fulfilled all obligations under that clause, and so far as the United Kingdom was concerned. We agreed on behalf of Canada that considering all the circumstances that was the case.

This statement, which stood for months unchallenged in the record of debates, was generally taken to mean that the British Government regarded the matter as closed and that the Canadian Government accepted the position. When the matter was raised by the Opposition in the Canadian House on March 8 this year, Mr. Howe told a questioner : "I was simply the messenger. I brought back Sir Stafford Cripps's positive statement that the British Government would not pay more in settlement of the contract. . . ."

The next day, (March 9, 1951), Mr. Gardiner told the House that the Hansard record of Mr. Howe's statement on June 5, 1950, was "obviously not a correct report." He maintained that seven words had been inadvertently omitted from the penultimate sentence. What Mr. Howe had actually said, according to his (Mr. Gardiner's) recollection, was :

The United Kingdom Government took a very strong position that they had fulfilled all obligations under that clause, and so far as the United Kingdom was concerned they did not intend to pay more.

He had made a mental note of it at the time, he explained, thus setting the evidence of his own (admittedly good) memory against the version of the official shorthand reporter.

The matter had been re-opened after a campaign by various farmers union leaders had roused hopes for a further compensation payment. This campaign met an eager response from prairie farmers, who were the victims of a combination of misfortunes. Their crops had been reduced by floods and frost. There was a shortage of railway rolling-stock, to carry their grain to the ports. Their

purchasing-power had been drastically reduced through devaluation and inflation.* Small wonder if some of them began to look on the wheat contract settlement as a piece of sharp trading on the part of *Perfidie Albion*. Edmond Prefontaine, who farms near St. Pierre, Manitoba, was quoted by the British United Press on March 10 as saying : " I felt we were making a contribution to the British, partly sentimental. It is hard for us to judge here but I don't think Britain lived up to the business deal, regardless of the sentimental part." Mr. M. J. Coldwell, national leader of the C.C.F. (Labour) party, told of receiving letters from Western Canada " saying that some people will boycott British goods on account of the manner in which the British have treated the western farmers."†

The farmers' " losses " under the contract were variously computed. Mr. S. N. Jones, President of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange, set them as high as \$700 million. Mr. Gardiner himself took the difference between the per-bushel payments received by American and Canadian farmers respectively during the contract years and, after allowing a differential in favour of the American, arrived at a loss figure of \$118 million. He suggested that the amount of compensation should be \$100 million, of which he was willing to concede \$35 million had been paid, leaving a balance due from Britain of \$65 million. The British Government did not accept this view. He made a " reckless pilgrimage " to London last February, in a vain attempt to obtain a further payment, returning empty-handed to face and, as we have seen, to survive the biggest crisis of his political career.

Looking back at the Wheat Agreement and other lesser contracts between Britain and Canada in the immediate post-war years, one cannot help feeling that too narrow a view is being taken of Anglo-Canadian trade on both sides of the Atlantic. We have allowed ourselves to become obsessed with paper calculations of " favourable " balances, overlooking the fact that profitable trade depends, in the long run, on mutual confidence and that the best bargaining-counter either country can possess is the goodwill of the other.

(The Anglo-Canadian author is a former London Correspondent of the Winnipeg Free Press.)

* Professor McDougall of The Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, has calculated that the purchasing value of the Canadian wheat dollar declined, taking 1935-1939 as the base period, to 7 cents in 1947-1948, and again to 80 cents in 1949-1950. Another authority estimated it had declined further to 71 cents in March of this year. In other words, the cost of the things the Canadian farmer has to buy, in order to produce his crop, has increased by 30 per cent. or more.

† He was alarmed by the suggestion of a boycott and felt that Britain's position had been misunderstood.

WHAT'S WRONG WITH LOCAL GOVERNMENT ?

BY LORD SILKIN

A SHORT time ago I was inquiring in a small country town in the South of England with a population of under 2,500 for the offices of the rural district council which takes its name from the town. The offices were about 300 yards from where I was. The first three local men I asked had never heard of the place and only the fourth, who happened to be an employee of the council, was able to direct me.

At the recent local elections the average number of electors going to the poll was under 25 per cent.—in some areas it was under five per cent. Ask the ordinary citizen—the man in the street—what is the name of his local councillor, or of the district council in which he is living ; it would be surprising if more than a small proportion of people gave the right answers. Often it is difficult to get suitable persons to stand for election to the council. In most places there is a contest, generally on party lines. But the fact that there is a contest is no proof of an adequate supply of satisfactory candidates. In a few instances no candidates at all have come forward for county council elections and seats have not been filled. There is a very natural confusion among electors when called upon to vote annually at municipal elections, one-third of the Council generally retiring by rotation each year. The unhappy elector can be excused at not appreciating the difference between the elections for the county council and those which come shortly after for the district council. In the end, he tends to call a plague on both of them and does not vote at all.

These things are symptomatic of the lack of interest and concern about the management of local affairs. They are indicative of the fact that local government—that is, government of the people by the people in local and domestic affairs—is in imminent danger of breaking down. Why is this so ? There is no one single simple reason. They are manifold and complex.

The existing local government authorities have been created at various times since the Municipal Corporations Act 1835 was passed. The Local Government Act of 1874, created urban and rural district councils. The Local Government Act 1888 set up the county councils and county boroughs as we know them to-day. The London County

Council was created in 1888, and the London Boroughs, that is the metropolitan boroughs, even later, in 1900. As a result of this multiplicity of legislation passed at various dates, creating different local authorities at different times with varying functions and at the same time allocating or taking away functions from them, we have a patch-work throughout England and Wales consisting of county councils, county boroughs, municipal or non-county boroughs, urban district councils, rural district councils and parish councils, to say nothing of the London County Council and the metropolitan boroughs.

The areas of these various authorities were largely, though not entirely, based upon older historic areas, and although these have changed greatly in importance and population in the past hundred years or more their status to-day rests upon what they enjoyed at the time they were created. The result is some startling anomalies. The county councils, generally speaking, administer the largest areas with the largest populations ; the rural and urban districts (apart from the parishes which have only insignificant functions) the smallest. Nevertheless, there are rural districts which are larger in area and have greater populations than a number of counties. The county boroughs range in population from over one million, in Birmingham, Manchester and Liverpool, to under 19,000 in Canterbury. In the larger counties, the distances to be travelled from some parts to the administrative centre are so great or the journey so difficult that it is sometimes impossible to do the return journey in one day. It is quite impossible for the members of such an authority to have first-hand knowledge of the area they are administering. Whether it be highways, or health services or education, not even the chairman of a committee can make himself personally acquainted with all detailed matters upon which he and his committee have to decide. This is not local government ; the area might just as well be administered from a Regional Centre—or even Whitehall ! In the case of a number of rural districts, on the other hand, there is often no suitable or convenient place within the area for council offices, where the inhabitants can call to discuss questions with which they are concerned, arising from the council's administration of local affairs, or where the councillors can meet. The council meetings take place outside the area and sometimes at a considerable distance.

A very important reason for the lack of interest on the part of the ordinary citizen is the confusion which exists between the functions of the different types of authority. How many people can say what is the difference in function between an urban district, a rural district and a non-county borough, or even between county boroughs and county councils ? If the student of local government believes that he has it clear in his mind then legislation comes along and changes the picture. In recent years many functions have been transferred

from one authority to another, generally from the district councils to the county councils, but sometimes it has gone the other way. The result is that only the limited number of persons who write textbooks on local government can say with any degree of accuracy what are the functions of the different authorities and even they are usually out of date before their book goes into print. Many important functions, as a result of nationalization or for other reasons of efficiency, have been taken entirely out of the hands of the local authorities and transferred either to the State or to public boards under the control of a Minister of the Crown. This applies particularly to such important services as electricity, gas, transport and the hospital services as well as to the majority of the services formerly administered under the Poor Law. There is little doubt that before long the supply of water will be nationalized. This process has been going on for a number of years with the result that, on balance, the powers of local authorities have become considerably depleted and, although each change could no doubt be fully justified theoretically on the score of efficiency, very few people have appreciated the cumulative effect of these transfers of functions on our democratic local government structure.

One of the inevitable consequences of a Government financial contribution towards a service is that the particular Government Department responsible for that service regards itself as a partner with the local authority and exercises varying degrees of control over its expenditure. In some cases it is so meticulous as to amount to an almost day-to-day control. In the case of other services the control is budgetary. Local authorities, especially the larger ones, regard this meticulous control as oppressive and detracting from their local responsibility and a good deal of dissatisfaction and frustration is in consequence felt. This problem is at present under discussion between the Government and representatives of local authorities with a view to giving to local authorities a greater measure of responsibility for expenditure. Clearly, complete local autonomy is impracticable where considerable national funds are involved but there is undoubtedly a trend towards a form of budgetary control in all services. Although local authorities are receiving more and more financial assistance from central funds and are left to bear less themselves, the financial resources of the local authorities vary so greatly that it is quite impossible for them to maintain anything like a uniform standard of quality or service. People living in adjoining local authority areas may find, for instance, the quality or standard of education so vastly different that it might well be a frequent factor in preventing desirable mobility. Moreover, many of the small authorities are so lacking in financial resources that they cannot afford to employ technical and administrative staff of the required

quality and members of the council have to make decisions without adequate advice. Then again, under the existing rating system, the financial resources of an area may be such that two people of equal incomes occupying similar accommodation in different areas may be paying vastly different sums by way of rates for identical services. It is obviously desirable that a pound spent by ratepayers of similar means in every part of the country should provide roughly the same benefit. A penny rate in one area with a population of 50,000 may produce ten times as much as a penny rate in another part of the country with the same population. This is a factor of great importance to industry (though less so since derating under the Local Government Act 1929) and frequently has a big influence in determining the location of a new factory.

Lastly, there are the conflicts that arise between different types of authorities which in existing circumstances are inevitable—particularly between the county councils and the county boroughs. The county councils who share local government functions with the district councils and who derive their funds from rates levied upon the inhabitants of these areas are naturally jealous of the county boroughs who are self-contained and administer all local government functions themselves, that is, what are known as all-purpose authorities and make no financial contribution to the county councils. One of the unfortunate effects of this conflict is that the county boroughs, which are generally very congested, have little land left for development and are incapable of rehousing within their own area such of their existing population as are overcrowded. They are, therefore, constantly pressing for an extension of their boundaries so as to provide themselves with the necessary space to carry out their reconstruction within an area controlled by them as well as to permit of expansion where they believe this to be in the public interest. On the other hand, they can do so only by depriving the county council of territory and of rateable value. This conflict results in great ill-feeling, resentment and indeed bitterness whenever a county borough seeks to extend its boundaries, however justified it may be, and where it feels there is a danger that it will be forced into perpetuating the existing cramped conditions. These conflicts are often fought out by way of expensive legal battles before parliamentary committees—battles in which the interests of the individual citizen tend to become subordinated to those of the dignity and status of the contesting authorities or their officials.

This is by no means an exhaustive account of what is wrong. Many students of local government have gone so far as to claim that it has completely broken down. Very few are satisfied with conditions as they are. There will probably be a very large measure of agreement about the defects which have been here set out. There might be some

disagreement as to the emphasis to be laid on them. If healthy local government consists of the people in a locality understanding—having a knowledge of and taking responsibility for the administration—of local affairs, then it must be universally agreed that local government does not seriously exist to-day. But the diagnosis of the sickness into which local government has fallen is child's play compared with the solution of the problem. The various associations of local authorities have each put forward proposals in recent years. Unfortunately, these proposals amount mainly to recommendations for leaving their own type of authority alone and reforming the others.

Although it must be obvious from what has been said that our local government structure is in need of a complete overhaul, no Government has so far been sufficiently courageous to undertake this because they have known in advance that there can be no agreed or wholly acceptable solution. It is nearly 30 years since the subject was last investigated by a royal commission. No effective action was taken as a result of the recommendations of that commission and the position has greatly deteriorated since then. It is not the purpose of this article to put forward a solution. A number of eminent writers have done so—among them G. D. H. Cole, Professor Robson and Mr. Blackburn. All one can hope to do is to lay down certain principles which should be followed in any such reorganization.

First and foremost is the need for a system of the utmost simplicity which the normal citizen can understand. This would indicate the need for at the most two types of authority : a major authority, exercising general responsibility for all the local services in the area which it covers, and subsidiary authorities to whom such services as are appropriate can be delegated. The major authorities should not be so large as to preclude the possibility of the elected representatives having personal contact with the services they administer. On the other hand, these major authorities should be viable, that is, in a financial position to carry out satisfactorily the services for which they are responsible up to at least a minimum prescribed standard. A difficulty arises here ; what is a suitable area for one service is not necessarily suitable for another. For instance, for town and country planning large areas are essential, even larger in many cases than the average county. This is probably also true in the case of education, if the authority is to provide the necessary variety of types of education suitable to all children's capabilities and aptitudes. On the other hand, the same type of area is not necessarily required for the police or fire services, while in exercising powers over the highway, again a larger authority is likely to be more efficient. It will be difficult to reconcile the conflicting claims between a large major authority for the purpose of carrying out some services and a smaller one for others, and it may well be that in the

case of some of these services the creation of joint authorities, to which there are considerable objections, cannot be avoided. The subsidiary authorities should be of such a size and character as to contain a suitable administrative centre readily accessible to all the inhabitants of the area. Housing is a difficult problem; probably the solution is that the major and subsidiary authorities should each have concurrent powers, the major authority carrying out the larger schemes and the subsidiary the smaller or purely local schemes. This distribution of functions has been carried out with a considerable measure of success in the case of the London County Council and the metropolitan boroughs.

The problem of London government, while as acute as in the rest of the country, may have to be considered specially and separately. The built-up area of London consists of the London County Council, three county boroughs and 140 district councils (which include the non-county boroughs). In addition, the counties of Middlesex, Essex, Surrey, Kent and Hertfordshire, as well as 28 metropolitan boroughs play a part. The boundaries of these various authorities have to-day no geographical, historic or any other significance and appear to the Londoner as quite arbitrary and unintelligible. The London County Council, while its administration is highly efficient, is responsible for administering the affairs of over four million people and has long ceased to be a local authority in any true sense of the word. While the relationship between the London County Council and the metropolitan boroughs is to-day friendly, in the past there has been a constant struggle over the allocation of functions. The London County Council has found it necessary to build housing estates in areas more and more distant from its own, up to as far as Slough, and this has created a great many financial and other problems, both for the London County Council and for the authorities in whose areas these new housing estates are situated. Obviously, the present position is quite unsatisfactory. A solution may well be found by the setting up of a number of two-tier authorities of a manageable size similar to what is proposed in the rest of the country, but the position of London is obviously going to be very much more difficult than elsewhere.

Probably the most serious criticism that will be levelled against the sort of reorganization proposed here is that it will involve the breaking up of a large number of existing recognized local government areas and the creation of entirely new ones. Many of these areas have a long history and tradition which should not be lightly destroyed but where history and tradition conflict with modern requirements and the true spirit of democracy and local government, which is to prevail?

In the present political and international situation it is very doubtful

whether any Government will be prepared to undertake this task. (It is always the wrong time to undertake anything so highly controversial !) And yet if we are to revive and preserve what we claim to be the basis of our democratic way of life, and what should be a training ground for really democratic Government, we must act quickly before it is too late, before what is still left of democratic local government is wholly lost.

Perhaps the wisest course at the present time is to follow the precedent of the three great State Reports, the Barlow, Uthwatt and Scott in the field of town planning, published during the last war. They led to a great deal of thought and discussion, and, soon after the end of the war, were followed by legislation. There is a need to bring the detailed facts of local government up-to-date and to set forth in clear language the problems and the possible solutions with a view to the Government of the day making up its mind and introducing the necessary legislation. There is a growing demand for a new and strong royal commission on local government. It is to be hoped that the powers-that-be will realize the urgency and importance of the problem and set it up without delay.

(The Rt. Hon. Lord Silkin, P.C., was Minister of Town and Country Planning from 1945 until February 1950.)

SCIENTISM AND PROFESSOR BARBARA WOOTTON—I

By J. B. COATES

SCIENTISM can be described as the attitude of mind which seeks to suppress philosophy and metaphysics and denies the value of all approaches to truth and reality but that of science. Berdyaev, joining forces on this issue with Kierkegaard, Scheler and Aspers, has condemned scientism in no measured terms. He speaks of it as the product of a slavish mentality which seeks to enslave the higher powers of the soul to one of its subordinate activities in the interest of what are called practical activities. The philosophical mode of cognition, he asserts, is distinct from and higher than the scientific mode. Philosophy has an intuitive basis, every true philosopher having an original intuition of his own, deriving from the uniqueness of his experience. While philosophy is based on the maximum experience of human existence, embracing man's affective and volitional as well as his intellectual life, science is merely the expression of one aspect of the life of the intellect. The significance of science must be assessed by philosophy, using criteria which science itself is unable either to supply or to judge. Knowledge of a scientific kind is on an inferior level of being to the existential world of the creative spirit, the world of value and of communion between persons, and should be recognized as being instrumental to it. In Berdyaev's view the tendency to make science supreme over religion and philosophy is usually an evidence of spiritual debasement as it is frequently marked by intellectual arrogance.

To attack scientism, needless to say, is not to criticize science; indeed it is almost superfluous at this time of day to give praise to science, whether one has in mind the respect for fact, for the rigour of the scientific method, of the true scientist, or the practical benefits which science has conferred. But when the venerator of science, unable to appreciate achievements outside his own province, proceeds to belittle and denigrate a greatness and a virtue which he does not understand, the grace of what should be an honourable zeal departs, and we are left with that aridity of spirit which has been the subject of much legitimate satire, as notably in the novels of Aldous Huxley. Professor Barbara Wootton's recent *Testament of Social Science**, with all its ability and clarity, is a forbidding example of the spiritual provincialism and dogmatism of "scientism". It is unfortunate that the praise which one would gladly allow to certain parts of her

* *Testament of Social Science*. By Barbara Wootton. Allen & Unwin. 15s.

book tends to be silenced by the repulsion which other parts of it inspire.

The purpose of her book is to commend, in the first place, the scientific method, and in the second place, the application of that method to the social sciences. Scientific method has been lauded and described in innumerable treatises, and the special case for the social sciences has been often stated. Nevertheless, though Professor Wootton has contributed nothing new to these themes, we can applaud the zeal with which she pleads her case. She is clearly right in pointing out that man in society is subject to conditioning circumstances, that the correlation of these circumstances with behaviour can be scientifically studied and statistical regularities in behaviour discovered, and that this provides us with knowledge that can be of great value, as, for example, in curing juvenile delinquency and ascertaining the determining factors of good human relationships in industry. It may well be true also that the value of such investigations is insufficiently realized and that the social sciences are as yet insufficiently endowed.

What Professor Wootton says on this is worthy of commendation, however frequently it may have been said before. Unfortunately the major part of her book is a series of attacks on individual thinkers and on schools of thinkers whose approach to human problems differs from her own, involving a series of excursions on her part into fields in which she has little competence and is by no means saved from egregious blunders. She feels an aversion to metaphysicians whose investigations, she remarks, can arrive at no verifiable truth, for if the truth can be verified, we are concerned with science, not with metaphysics. She recognizes that the metaphysician cannot provide us with speculations, involving the asking and answering of questions where, in the nature of the case, no convincing answer can be obtained, but adds that this is irritating to persons like herself who believe that the purpose of asking questions is to get answers to them. She speaks of the curiously ineffective character of most criticism of the arts, attributing this to the weakness of its scientific backbone, and remarking that aesthetic criticism is, strictly speaking, a branch of scientific inquiry. She writes with great contempt on theology, which she clearly does not begin to understand, and shows particular obtuseness in her references to "revelation". She refers to the "superstition" of Christianity and to its "melancholy record of cruelty and intolerance." She annexes the province of ethics for science, deriving her ethical canon from biology, good behaviour being that which is directed towards physical and mental health or towards "the normal completion or actualization of the organism." In her remarks on these and other questions she takes it on herself to clear up the "muddles" left by the irrational and wish-fulfilment

thinking of those whom she selects as her victims.

Berdyaev has remarked that scientific knowledge belongs to the lowest and least personal sphere of communion ; it is concerned entirely with the objective world, with what Buber calls the World of It ; it is "the appropriate mode of communication of the spiritually disintegrated." "The universally binding character of cognition is found in the highest degree in mathematics and the physical sciences where cognition depends least on men sharing a spiritual community." This inability to understand the 'personal' world is strongly marked in Professor Wootton's criticisms. She is impatient at the metaphysical passion displayed by such men as Whitehead, and Berdyaev himself, men who seek to make the best picture they can of the universe as a whole, finding a place in their overall picture for their personally apprehended ethical and aesthetic values. The good metaphysician would, indeed, realize that his interpretation is incapable of being checked by any scientific test, though this does not mean that he does not take into account all available knowledge while continually testing his values existentially. Nevertheless, though he cannot prove the truth of his interpretation, he feels that it is one of man's noblest traits to seek to explain the world and to fit his valuations into a general metaphysical picture. To be lacking in the metaphysical passion, to feel no wish to make some sort of coherent picture of the universe for oneself, is a curious inhibition of the typical worshipper of science.

Even granted her scientific bias, that Barbara Wootton should overlook the essentially personal nature of aesthetic criticism is remarkable. One values the interpretation of a good critic primarily because it expresses the personal impact of some particular work on mind sensitive to certain kinds of impressions and experiences. To apply scientific categories to such criticism is a misuse of logic and shows as little understanding of the purpose and method of science as of the purpose of art and of criticism. This is not to deny that advances in science, for example in psychology, will influence in some ways the actual content of criticism. Professor Wootton's failure to distinguish between the personal world which has the uniqueness of personality itself, and the world of scientific knowledge, which is the same for everyone, is seen in her references to revelation, which she criticizes for its lack of universality and irresistibility. The essential character of a 'revealed' truth is that it depends for its apprehension on a certain sensitiveness or insight of the personal medium, that it does not belong to the world of objective knowledge, though insight, which was at first the fruit of revelation, may later become widespread. For example, the values revealed in the poetry of Wordsworth and of Keats cannot be universally communicated as can a scientific fact, yet they exercise in the long run a considerable

effect on the general human aesthetic sensitiveness.

Barbara Wootton's attacks on Christianity are especially noteworthy for her inability to understand Christianity as a religion of personal experience as distinct from a belief in concepts and doctrines. In a passage in *The Crisis of the University* Sir Walter Moberly remarks that one cannot be genuinely agnostic about the issue of theism, that one is bound to commit oneself one way or the other. By a belief in God Sir Walter Moberly means a realization of the value of a relationship with a "living God"; the loving, creative spirit which we can find within ourselves he regards as the presence of the divine in man, and he holds that in life we must either seek a relationship with God in this sense or live without it, that there is no third alternative. Sir Walter's meaning is, I think, clear, though it might be said in answer that people might have an experience virtually identical with what he calls a "God relationship" but call it by some other name. Professor Wootton's attack on Sir Walter is based on the assumption that what the latter means by belief in God is assent to the hypothesis that God exists, and she holds that there is no sufficient evidence either for or against such a hypothesis. She remarks that worship of, or communion with, a deity of whose existence one is not absolutely convinced, is likely to be an unsatisfying experience. In this last remark she is certainly right. The worship of God regarded as a concept or hypothesis, proved or unproven, is likely to be not merely unsatisfying but impossible. But the "living God" of whom Sir Walter speaks is not a concept or hypothesis; relationship to such a God belongs to the personal world of the artist or the good critic or the seer to whom truth is 'revealed'. I am not concerned here with either the philosophical or the psychological interpretation of such religious experiences, but merely to remark that Barbara Wootton's criticisms are not relevant to them. In the terms of Sir Walter's remarks, she is rightly spoken of as an atheist, not an agnostic, for by believing in God Sir Walter means having a personal relationship with God.

Professor Wootton's treatment of ethical problems is one of many examples we could quote of the disposition of the high priests of 'scientism' to rush confidently into fields into which those better acquainted with the intellectual disciplines involved tread gingerly. She draws her canon for the good life from biology in the conception of physical and mental health. On this criterion many boxers and professional cricketers would satisfy all reasonable demands, while Pascal, Kierkegaard and D. H. Lawrence would fail miserably to qualify. The more specific ethical standard which she puts forward that good action is that which subserves the "self-maintenance, development and reproduction" of an organism, shares the characteristic limitation of all biological criteria, a failure to distinguish

between man as mere organism and man as person. She does not, indeed, confine herself within the limits of any particular interpretation. She is impressed by the evidence that neuroses are often caused by failure to adapt oneself to the society in which one lives, and rates conformity to communal standards very highly. She refers to the investigations of anthropologists who have claimed to show that human standards and behaviour are almost entirely determined by the "culture concept" of the society in which one lives, and remarks that religious sanctions for morality are not needed as the primary moral sanction is the need to keep in step. The sense men have of the absoluteness of moral standards she attributes to the psychological mechanism of the super-ego.

Her treatment of such problems, based as it is on assorted scraps drawn from the physical and social sciences, reveals the limitations of any ethical analysis which is not based on insight drawn from the personal level of experience. The kind of experience on which she sets most store, that of adjusting oneself to the society in which one lives, is precisely the experience which personalist and existentialist thought ranks least highly and indeed describes as 'inauthentic'. Both to Kierkegaard and Sartre, both to the Christian and atheist existentialist, 'authentic' personality only begins when the individual begins to distinguish himself from custom and tradition and the codes of society, and to build a value structure that is 'personal', an individual creation. Did not Jesus, indeed, teach the same when he sought to replace the dispensation of the law by that of the spirit? Professor Wootton takes into little account the consideration that personality at its higher levels is both self regulating and unique. The more man achieves his full potentialities, the more fully he enters into the rich, individualized world of personal relations, the less is the part that social conditioning and 'moral principles' play in his behaviour. Her book is one more illustration of the truth that the scientific approach is better adapted to dealing with the simpler and more primitive modes of behaviour than with the more developed and more personal; it is certainly much more difficult in the case of highly differentiated personalities to find those statistical regularities on which the social scientist counts for the discovery of his laws.

The tendency of the social scientist to overlook the truth that the true development of the person is in the direction of replacing communal conditioning by self regulation is not without its dangers. In the first place, the scientist is apt to exaggerate the extent to which we should try to change the nature of man through what William Reich calls "a scientifically regulated social order" or a "planned economy of human biological energy." With the help of the scientist society can undoubtedly control with a very high degree of efficiency the behaviour of man. A number of contemporary

satires, for example, Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* and George Orwell's 1984 have shown us how society can be scientifically planned. But such planning is always at the expense of the maiming of personality, the destruction of all that is most human in man. The lesson that needs to be drawn is that the rôle of the social scientist should be thought of as largely a negative one, the removal of those conditions which inhibit man's capacity for self-regulation, that prevent him from rising from the level of organism to that of 'person'.

Unfortunately the particular preoccupation and bias of the scientist, in particular when he displays a marked disposition towards 'scientism', tend to impoverish his understanding of the personal world. A hundred years ago Kierkegaard observed, among men absorbed in the study of science and the objective world, a tendency to arrested development as far as the religious, ethical and aesthetic worlds were concerned. Laboratory studies do not demand that capacity for moral decision, for personal relationships, for aesthetic appreciation and creation which are involved in a truly human existence. Professor Wootton is, of course, right in urging that the social scientist has a valuable rôle to play, but it is inadvisable either to over-emphasize it or to overlook its dangers or to give the social scientist too much power.

In his book *What Dare I Think?*, a book dedicated to the cause of 'scientific humanism', Julian Huxley remarked that unfortunately the over-specialization of our time was tending to produce one class of individuals with scientific hypertrophy and religious atrophy and another with scientific atrophy and religious hypertrophy; the former class failed to understand that values are perceived emotionally and regarded religion as a pathological phenomenon; the latter class glorified the values of aesthetic and religious experience but had an undisguised contempt for the results and methods of science. Professor Huxley added that the evils of what he referred to as the antagonism between science and a true humanism were incalculable, preventing as it did the right and vigorous application of the united faculties of the soul for the solution of our problems. With all its merits Barbara Wootton's book displays precisely the scientific hypertrophy of which Julian Huxley was speaking. In particular she fails to recognize that the scientific mode of experience, the mode of approaching reality through the observation and discovery of objective fact and reliable knowledge, differs fundamentally from the personal mode, the religious and aesthetic mode, which is concerned primarily with value and personal relationships. The error is a serious and widespread one, and an attack on it is worthy of some of that combativeness which she shows in her own cause.

(*Mr. Coates is the author of The Crisis of the Human Person.*)

SCIENTISM AND PROFESSOR BARBARA WOOTTON—II

BY BARBARA WOOTTON

I MUST confess that I find Mr. Coates's method of controversy rather difficult to deal with. Much of his article consists of assertion, unsupported by argument ; indeed his case largely rests upon a denial of the necessity for, or even the validity of, argument. His opening summary of Berdyaev's views on the proper relations of science and philosophy, for instance, illustrates the difficulty. On the assumption that whenever Berdyaev's opinions conflict with those of someone else, Berdyaev is necessarily right and the other chap wrong, this would be helpful. But unless we make that assumption, all that emerges is that Mr. Coates prefers Berdyaev's opinions to mine. Those who do not agree with Berdyaev on this or that point are unlikely to be moved by the discovery that Berdyaev does not agree with them—unless and until some evidence can be produced which will settle the issue between them. Nor do I myself think that an intellectual argument is strengthened by personal vilification of those who find it unconvincing. Mr. Coates makes reference to my "obtuseness", and accuses me of making "a series of excursions . . . into fields" in which I have little competence", and of writing on topics that I "clearly do not begin to understand." If these charges are well-founded, I should have thought that the fact would emerge unmistakably from the "egregious blunders" that I must have made. My book* is, as Mr. Coates says, combative ; but not, I submit, on this plane.

The essential difference between Mr. Coates and myself is in the value which we place as evidence on "insight drawn from the personal level of experience." Actually he is mistaken in saying that I fail to distinguish between "the personal world, which has the uniqueness of personality itself, and the world of scientific knowledge, which is the same for everyone." On the contrary, I attach as much importance to this distinction as he does, as he may see from page 71, where I suggest that one of the fundamental reasons why much esthetic criticism is ineffective is this very failure to distinguish between "having an experience and asking questions about that experience." The real difference between Mr. Coates and myself is not that the one does, and the other does not, recognize the existence of "personally apprehended ethical and aesthetic values", or of

* *Testament of Social Science*, by Barbara Wootton. Allen & Unwin. 15s.

man's urge to "fit his valuations into a general metaphysical picture": the real difference turns on the *interpretation* of those personal experiences, and the light which we expect them to throw upon the problems of human social life.

If I understand them rightly, Mr. Coates and Berdyaev hold that these experiences are in some sense superior to scientific knowledge, which being concerned only "with the objective world" is in fact the "appropriate mode of communion of the spiritually disintegrated." The spiritual value of personal aesthetic and religious experiences is a matter which (on Mr. Coates's argument—and also, incidentally, on mine!) everyone must judge for himself. I am concerned in my book only with their status as evidence of this very "objective world" in which we live. Part of Mr. Coates's quarrel seems indeed to boil down to a complaint that I have not written a book in praise of mysticism, instead of a study of scientific method. Actually I made no attempt to assess the spiritual value of purely personal experiences, because to do so would have been quite irrelevant to my subject; and this would indeed have been an "excursion into a field in which I have little competence." I was only led on from an analysis of method in the social sciences to a discussion of religion, morals and art because I have found from experience that there is an area here where two kinds of "knowledge" may come into conflict; and one has to find a criterion by which to judge between them. Incidentally, it may be of interest to add that this experience was quite unexpected. When I began to study and teach the social sciences some years ago, it never occurred to me that I should find myself writing a book that was largely concerned with religious and theological doctrines. My doing so was the direct result of the resistance which I found that many people offered, when it was a question of social problems, to the basic scientific principle of following the argument from observation wherever it may lead. Similarly, from their side also the Christians are coming to recognize the beginnings of a new conflict. Thus Dr. Langmead Casserley, writing from a specifically Christian standpoint in his new book on *Morals and Man in the Social Sciences*,* foresees that "a conflict between religion and the social sciences will become, as the latter develop and establish themselves, more and more of a possibility."

Leaving on one side the question of spiritual valuation (and this is an unprofitable theme for argument since it can in the nature of the case only be dealt with by assertion and counter assertion), we are thus left with these two sometimes conflicting sources of "knowledge"—science and insight. Even here I have frankly admitted (p. 104) that, where revelation does not deal with the same phenomena as science,

* *Morals and Man in the Social Sciences*, by J. V. Langmead Casserley. Longmans. 12s. 6d.

or produce accounts of phenomena which conflict with those reached by scientific method, "the scientist is in no position categorically to deny the claim of revelation as a source of knowledge." I do, however, go on to say that a scientist is bound to emphasize the universality of his own data, in contrast with the limited and contradictory character of what is revealed ; and that he will naturally expect the findings of revelation or of insight to be treated, like his own laws, as hypotheses open to modification in the light of later knowledge.

This is the crux of the matter. As Mr. Coates rightly points out, criticize revelation for its lack of universality and irresistibility. Anyone who is looking for practical help in the solution of a number of pressing social problems can hardly do otherwise, because personal experience in this context is, as Mr. Coates so aptly emphasizes, unique. And by definition you cannot learn from any unique experience, since learning consists in interpreting one situation in the light of a similar one that you have met before. The trouble about dreams and visions is just their very deficiency in that impersonal universality which makes scientific demonstration so convincing. People derive all sorts of things from their inner personal experiences. One man will be seized with an overwhelming sense of the presence and love of a divine being ; another will be convinced that he is himself a re-incarnation of Napoleon ; and occasionally (but not, in our society very often) one may even be found who is overwhelmed with the urge to sell all his possessions and give the proceeds to the poor. One man's vision is, in fact, another man's delusion ; and his situation is not resolved by each blandly asserting that his own experience is "the truth". In view of all the conflicts, and of the very sizeable body of people who derive no conviction of truth from any such experience, it is just no use claiming that from these sources we can arrive at truths comparable to the proposition that water turns to ice when it gets very cold.

And, of course, half the time Mr. Coates doesn't claim this. One might fairly say that he first explicitly renounces this claim and then goes on implicitly to assume its validity. By way of denial, he says that "the good metaphysician would, indeed, realize that his interpretation is incapable of being checked by any scientific test . . ." and "cannot prove (italics mine) the truth of his interpretation" but he will "take into account all available knowledge." Yet a few paragraphs earlier J. B. Coates, following Berdyaev, has declared that philosophy has an intuitive basis, every true philosopher having an original intuition of his own, deriving from the uniqueness of his experience. . . . The significance of science must be assessed by philosophy, using criteria which science itself is unable either to apply or to judge." Surely if that is so, it is really a confession of

weakness on the part of the metaphysician even to have hinted at the possibility of applying a scientific test to his theories, still more to "take into account all available knowledge." He should have had the courage of Berdyaev's and J. B. Coates's convictions and boldly declared : " Science says so and so, but philosophy, which is derived from my unique experience, assesses this as an observation of low significance. Kindly, therefore, pay little attention to this discovery of science." Could anyone say more plainly: " Daddy knows best"? I wonder why Berdyaev, with Mr. Coates apparently in support, accuses his opponents of " intellectual arrogance " ?

Mr. Coates, having on the one hand admitted that no good metaphysician can prove his interpretations, does not shrink, when it suits his case, from proclaiming on the other his own philosophic intuitions as " truths ". Thus we read of the tendency of the social scientist to overlook the "*truth* (italics mine) that the true development of the person is in the direction of replacing communal conditioning by self-regulation." What is this " truth " and where does it come from ? It is unfavourably contrasted with some hypotheses of mine, which, according to Mr. Coates, are based on " assorted scraps from the physical and social sciences ", and are held to be inadequate because they are not " based on insight drawn from the level of personal experience." It is, of course, a matter of opinion, but I would hold to the view that a proposition for which some scientific evidence is adduced (and I would have hoped that this was not quite so scrappy as Mr. Coates makes out) really has a better claim to consideration than one based on my own, or Mr. Coates's, or Hitler's personal intuitive insight. Significantly, Mr. Coates gives no evidence, other than his own personal insight for this " truth " that the " true development of the person is in the direction of replacing communal conditioning by self-regulation." Actually, I myself happen to think that there is a good deal of evidence for such a view (even on the psycho-biological criterion of ethics which I have tentatively suggested in my book) ; but Mr. Coates cannot, of course, deign to look at, or to quote any evidence, because to do so would be to admit the dilemma that his proposition must be either a personal value-judgment, which can neither be proved nor refuted by evidence, or an intellectual proposition which must stand or fall by the weight of evidence for or against it. To admit this dilemma would be fatal to a thesis in which he is in fact trying to have it both ways, claiming the authority of demonstrated truth for his private opinions. Mr. Coates has every right to believe in the value of self-regulation as opposed to communal conditioning ; but he must not denounce other people because they refuse to allow this opinion, even when dressed up as unique philosophic experience, to carry the weight of conviction that attaches to truths that are scientifically demonstrated.

This "insight" business is, of course, dangerous doctrine. It carries the risk of intolerance, implicit in all authoritarian doctrines. The risk peeps out even in Mr. Coates's article. "Professor Wootton, of course, right in urging that the social scientist has a valuable rôle to play, but it is inadvisable either to over-emphasize it or to overlook its dangers or to give the social scientist too much power." The sentence has a strangely familiar ring; the scientist is all right as long as he doesn't find out too much, and people don't get to hear of, and set store by, what he has to say. Those are the "dangers" against which we must protect ourselves—by methods, one fears, which are only too well known. Shades of Galileo! Shades of Darwin! But shades perhaps also of King Canute!

Mr. Coates is, moreover, unduly ready to ascribe to others the pragmatism that is inherent in his own assertions. He has, in fact, seriously misrepresented the whole of my chapter on morals. Throughout my book I was extremely careful to distinguish between observations of phenomena, which are a legitimate basis for scientific discovery, and value-judgments, which are beyond the reach of science, and must in the last resort be matters of opinion, or as some would prefer to say, matters of taste. I do not see how he can say: "She annexes the province of ethics for science" if he has read the following passage which appears (p. 119) at the opening of my chapter on morals.

Science establishes laws of association, but laws of association are like maps; they show you which road leads to which destination, but they cannot tell you where you ought to go. So there comes a point, in questions of morals, or, indeed, in any choice of ultimate ends, at which science can no longer speak with authority. This much, indeed, we are bound at some point to admit, though it does not follow that science has no hints to give on the matter, still less that she has no comment to make on the authoritarian judgments made by others.

Five pages later I repeat the caution:

At some point . . . we reach an ultimate end or value which cannot be explained in terms of anything else. . . . At this point the accepted proofs of scientific demonstration are no longer available. In the natural sciences proof is finally established by appeal to primary sensory data. . . . With the best will in the world we cannot find a similar standard of direct, primary, universally recognized experience which determines our notions of morality so clearly that nobody, unless perhaps a professional philosopher, worries about their validity.

Subject always to that proviso, I have then set out to find a criterion ethical value, which, though its validity cannot be scientifically demonstrated, seems likely to appeal to the scientifically-minded, and be more consistent than are some others with a scientific approach to social questions. Stated very shortly, the ethical system which arrive at is one that regards as moral those actions which promote

the full mental and physical development of individual human organisms ; but this summary formulation necessarily lacks precision, and to put into one sentence what demands a whole chapter of clarification and discussion is just to invite misunderstanding. I will only add that the criterion proposed is essentially a human standard, based on what appears to be good for man, without any claim that this is good in any absolute sense beyond that. It may perhaps appeal to the scientifically-minded, because it is conceived in biological terms ; and biology is the science concerned with living creatures, of which man is one species. It "brings the moral activities of our uniquely endowed species into harmony with the 'directiveness and creativeness inherent' in all life ; it is consistent with the discoveries of science in the fields of biology and psychology ; and it does not require any superfluous, still less any supernatural hypothesis. I know no other system of moral values of which all these things can be said."

At the very least such an ethical system is, I suggest, likely to be more widely acceptable than one that is based upon our traditional Christianity. The difficulty about the Christian ethic to-day is that Christian doctrine has to be so much watered down to make it credible to anybody with even the smallest smattering of scientific knowledge—with the result that the moral precepts of Christianity are left in mid-air, robbed of any solid foundation. Our society does indeed take a tremendous risk in allowing its morality to depend either upon people pretending to believe a miraculous story which they plainly find incredible, or upon the willingness of the public at large to perform the complicated mental gymnastics by which modern theologians contrive to make this story mean something different from what it says—gymnastics, which significantly enough, figure more in learned works that are read by the few, than in sermons and exhortations addressed to the many, which still constantly imply the literal truth of the gospel story. Most of the population of this island do not normally go to Church, and show no sign of an effective belief in Christianity. There is, therefore, real danger of moral vacuum, and a real need for this to be filled in terms that are in harmony with the magnificent body of new knowledge that the human mind has established in the past two centuries—knowledge which incidentally is itself the primary cause of the rejection of religious dogmas. I have merely suggested the conception of "the normal completion or actualization of the whole organism"—in popular terms the attainment of mental and physical health—as one person's contribution towards the important task of filling that vacuum.

Mr. Coates may quote Messrs. Berdyaev, Kierkegaard, Scheler and Jaspers to prove that all this is the product of a "slavish

mentality," "spiritual debasement" and "aridity of spirit". I can only say that it does not feel like that. The work of pushing forward the frontiers of knowledge into the territory of ignorance and superstition is always immensely exciting ; and it yields deep and lasting satisfactions—satisfactions which are greater than ever now that man has begun seriously to apply to his own nature and problems the techniques by which he has gained so amazing a mastery of his material environment. Moreover, there are plenty of witnesses to testify that the scientific approach to human problems in no way inhibits feelings of love for other human beings, or aesthetic emotion, or even a sense of awe at the majesty of the universe. Some of these experiences have been, and others may soon be, scientifically "explained" ; their quality to those who experience them remains unaffected. Maternal affection has a very obvious biological function ; but mothers do not love their children less for knowing that. I can but repeat : there is a difference—a world of difference—between having an emotional experience, and asking, or even answering, questions about it. But, notwithstanding Mr. Coates, however delightful and satisfying these inner personal experiences may be, they have repeatedly shown themselves to be unreliable foundations for propositions about the nature of man and the world in which he lives. Science continues to win every time at that.

Mrs. Barbara Wootton is Professor of Social Studies in the University of London.)

RACINE IN THE EUROPEAN TRADITION

BY DENIS SAURAT

THE opportunity to look into the question of Racine's qualities from both a French and a European point of view is provided by Dr. Brereton's critical biography*. This will certainly take its place among the best books in French and in English not only on Racine but on the French classical tradition generally. Since Lytton Strachey's statements in his *Landmarks in French Literature* (1912) I do not think that anything so important in this field has appeared in English. It is therefore possible, since the light skirmishing of Strachey has been followed by the thorough-going strategy of Dr. Brereton, that a certain point has been reached in the English appreciation of Racine at least among the really cultured public.

Dr. Brereton has written first of all a very lively biography. It is as entertaining as any historical novel and yet the documentation is unimpeachable. Many readers will learn with a kind of awe that at one time Louis XIV, a staunch friend and admirer of Racine, was prevailed upon to allow a royal warrant to be issued for the arrest of Racine as a poisoner. This occurred in 1680 after all his triumphs and was connected with the famous poisoning trial that centred round La Voisin. Needless to say, Racine was quite innocent and though not arrested he seems to have had a great scare. This was not really such an exceptional situation in his life as might be thought and Dr. Brereton's chapters entitled "Towards Security" and "The Bourgeois Years" explain only too well that Racine indeed needed peace during the last period of his 60 years' life. Much of the chatter and many of the extraordinary adventures of the century are fascinatingly presented in this book.

Alongside a narrative that will give pleasure to the most unsophisticated reader, literary criticism accompanies the analysis of the plays and culminates in an admirable last chapter on the originality of Racine. We are shown the perfect technique of his language and verse—and also why no-one can ever make use of either that language or that kind of verse again. We are shown also the technique of play construction in the hands of a master who was faultless in his great dramas—possibly the only one to be so. Besides this quality of form Dr. Brereton explains the originality of Racine in

* *Jean Racine* by Geoffrey Brereton. Cassell. 22s. 6d.

his treatment of love and of female character. "Racine's achievement was to weave the analysis into the action so closely that the two became one—such characters, more remote from reality than any Cornelian giants or Shakespearian virgins, he presents with so masterly an illusion of life that they have become an essential factor in West European literature, which to-day would be crippled without them." Thus it would seem that the women in Meredith and in Virginia Woolf belong to a tradition really founded by Racine.

This puts the problem of European culture clearly before us. Europe's well-known lines are no longer an adequate explanation :

We conquer'd France, but felt our captive's charms ;
Her art victorious triumph'd o'er our arms.

And if this explanation of French influence is insufficient, perhaps the repudiation of that influence is also in some measure unjustified. On many occasions Dr. Brereton quotes Mallarmé alongside Racine, and the lasting influence of the French symbolists and post-symbolists on English literature is a subject for thought. If Racine were as thoroughly repudiated as his critics thought, would the English have come back to that France of Mallarmé which was not so different as some think from the France of Racine ?

It is not sufficiently realized that the great French classical period from Pascal to Voltaire is not only a French triumph but is also the expression of a permanent European mentality. In fact, if you compare the French middle ages and the French Renaissance with the French seventeenth century, it might be said that the French classical school is not properly French at all. This of course was held to be the truth by Victor Hugo and the whole romantic school who were partly right although largely wrong. Why did Europe in the seventeenth century, as Pope bears witness, accept so wholeheartedly the cult of Racine ? It is surely no explanation to say that it was because Louis XIV had been defeated. About 1700, the French were universally detested in Europe. Why should Europe except their literature had it not been that in that literature Europe recognized something it had been striving after for centuries ? In Racine and Molière and Boileau, just as later in Voltaire, Europe saw what it had been looking for since 1300. A careful reading of Dr. Brereton's last chapter will lead any impartial mind to the conclusion that this ideal woman created at last in perfect artistic form by Racine is none other than the ideal woman longed for by Dante and Petrarch. Racine did not create this type by brooding over Dante and Petrarch (as far as we can tell Racine could have known very little about them). It was the whole of Europe that was trying once more to express its highest dream. We find glimpses of

it in Chaucer and indeed more than mere glimpses. The dream is in Shakespeare ; and Ruskin's disquisition on Shakespeare's women and their superiority to Shakespeare's men could be applied to Racine with but a few changes. Ben Jonson, 60 years before Racine or Molière, is striving after qualities which are to be found fully grown in the great French dramatists. And Jonson represents the English intellect at least as much and possibly more than Shakespeare himself. The tragedies of *Sejanus* and *Catiline* are prefigurations in English of the French achievements by Corneille and Racine. It would be easy to show that in Spain Calderon and even the awe-inspiring Lope de Vega as well as many others were also predecessors of the French and there were others in Italy whose names have not grown big enough.

Nor is this surprising. The whole of Europe had been brought up on Greek and Latin classics and the whole of Europe had added to this fundamental patrimony its own peculiar acquisition of Christian ideals. No single nation in Europe had yet disturbed this common inheritance by separatist efforts. Culture had been one from Dante to Racine and each of the European peoples had acquired as much as it could. Popular romances and individualistic poets had really had very little influence. They had been fashions for cultured ladies rather than seriously-taken trends. The other nations had had greater literary men than the French : Dante, Petrarch, Shakespeare, Cervantes had and have more power and more breadth than Racine and Molière. But somehow not one of them had really expressed what Europe was seeking ; probably just because their individualities were so much more powerful than those of the French classics. Europe could not recognize itself in the ferocity of Dante or in the excessive sophistication of Petrarch, any more than in the gigantic disorder of Shakespeare. It did recognize itself in Molière and Racine and Boileau. Dr. Brereton allows himself the easy taunt against Boileau. It is tempting to triumph over Boileau but Voltaire said that it brought bad luck to the blasphemer ; in his main idea Boileau was entirely in the right and still is. After the recognition of Racine's greatness will come the recognition of Boileau's greatness. But this can only be a parenthesis now.

So let us revert to Lytton Strachey as a witness of the solidity, so often misunderstood and even unperceived, of the French influence.

At the present day, all over Europe, the main characteristics of the average play may be traced straight back to their source in the dominating genius of Molière.

We must look, not at Shakespeare's masterpieces, for they are transfused and consecrated with the light of transcendent genius, but at the average play of an ordinary Elizabethan playwright, or even at one of the lesser works of Shakespeare himself. And, if we look here, it will become apparent that the dramatic tradition of the Elizabethan age was an extremely faulty one. It allowed, it is true, of great richness, great variety, and the sublimest heights of poetry ; but it also allowed

an almost incredible looseness of structure and vagueness of purpose, of dullness, of insipidity, and of bad taste.

Nor can there be any doubt that Racine's view of what a drama should be has been justified by the subsequent history of the stage. The Elizabethan tradition has died out—or rather it has left the theatre, and become absorbed in the modern novel, and it is the drama of crisis—such as Racine conceived it—which is now the accepted model of what a stage-play should be.

Dr. Brereton's book thus brings us to a consideration of one of the fundamental trends of European literature—not of course the only tendency, but the only one that is constant. From the opposed tendency which may be called a romantic one and which is also a fundamental European position, no coherent picture can be drawn. The so-called "romantic" or purely individualistic element in each writer is of necessity inimitable and at enmity with the originality of every other writer. There is no common measure between what is purely Dantesque in Dante and what is purely Shakespearian in Shakespeare. (Luckily both carry also much of the *classical* tradition.) Lovers of great poetry may justifiably maintain that they care most dearly in each poet for what is peculiar and inimitable in him and none can say them nay. But they run the risk of being merely literary epicureans bent solely on enjoying themselves. A wider problem is before those who care about culture, as such, and the very future of civilization. The romantic cult leads necessarily to anarchy, since each man being a law unto himself each nation is a law unto itself. Then what of the future? Europe to-day speaks no common language, and it cannot speak a common language because it has not a common mentality. I do not mean only that we have no means of intellectual intercourse with Russia—that is too obvious—but we have none with Germany or Spain and we really know very little about Italy. Even between France and England at the present day there is really no common language and the two nations in 1951 do not understand each other at all. It may be that a more European point of view prevails among the smaller nations, the cultured people of Switzerland and Sweden with many others, but what can they do? Let alone the Americans, either northern or southern). We in Europe to-day do not mean the same thing, from one nation to the other, when we use apparently the same words, and more fundamentally when we seem to agree about the same ideas. Our implications are different and sometimes radically different.

It is a delusion to think that we can create a common language and understand one another if we begin by agreeing on practical things, like railway lines and the distribution of coal or the production of steel. However necessary those operations may be they will always hide potential catastrophes unless the aims behind the practical arrangements are in harmony among the different nations. Taking

this argument higher, unless the various nations are in agreement at the top about some ideal common to most of them, nothing of any permanent value will be done even in the arrangements of railway and steel. In other words, unless a common culture is once more created throughout Europe, nothing can be achieved that will put an end to our present most dangerous situation. This does not mean in the least that political problems can be solved by solving artistic ones. But it means that the work of the artist is an essential part of the solution, though it may not be sufficient in itself any more than practical arrangements are sufficient in themselves. But unless you achieve an *entente* in the domain of the mind as well as in practical affairs, nothing can be done.

The solution of the theoretical problem is therefore essential and this problem can only be solved in the realm of art and more particularly of literature. On the highest level of all, here are no dissident interests as there are in political matters. There are no ruling incompetent and haphazard mobs to change an electoral situation from month to month or from day to day. There are no would-be tyrants with power and no professional *arrivists* with irresistible intrigues. Here, quality only decides and in the course of a few years and after some oscillations quality always tells. And yet by a strange but natural phenomenon in this domain where everything is so easy if only literary or artistic genius is present, there is really very little that we can do except see clearly what the situation is. We can neither produce genius nor direct it but we can see it when it is there and long for it when it is not ; it may be that the clear realization of a problem is a sort of prayer to higher powers and elicits some answer.

Let us face, however, that the fact that Europe has at some period in the past been a unity and that Racine has at one point been a spokesman of that unity at its highest, can only help us indirectly now. To try to write like Racine, or construct a play as he constructed his—even to think of women, be it ideal women, as he did—would be a ridiculous failure. Dr. Brereton notes well that these conceptions and practices are “remote from reality” and are a “masterly illusion of life.” We cannot reconstruct a culture on the forms of art or on the thoughts of the past. Racine is essentially useful to us, if we understand him, because he proves to us that our problem can be solved. He had as much of a problem—together with Corneille and Molière and Boileau and Bossuet—as we have to-day. It was possible to construct a European unity in the seventeenth century ; it is possible theoretically therefore to construct a European ideal now. No doubt it will have to be totally different from the Racinean picture and no doubt the forms of expression employed will have to be quite different too. Nevertheless, there will have to be, since Europe is a continuity, something in common between

Racine and us as there was something in common between even Dante and Shakespeare and Racine. The deep soul of Europe must surely continue ; otherwise a totally different " thing "—one dare not say civilization—will emerge. It will no longer be us.

Meditation over the past is consequently an essential element to our construction of the future. Hence the vital importance of Racine to-day as a model of what has been done in the past and an omen of what might be done in the future. From this point of view perhaps not sufficient attention has been paid to Mr. T. S. Eliot's very curious *Notes Towards the Definition of Culture* which seems to be concerned with the past but which is really preoccupied with the future. In many ways Dr. Brereton's book on Racine, unconnected though it be with the present-day poet's meditations, is one of the best possible illustrations in practical history of the inner meaning of Mr. T. S. Eliot's book. It is perhaps not too optimistic to think that the concern with our present situation shown in works of this kind and the quality of thinking that is thereby evidenced, are hopeful symptoms for our future.

(The author who retired in 1950 is Professor Emeritus of French Language and Literature in the University of London.)

FIRE ON THE SIERRA

BY TERENCE DENNIS

THROUGHOUT the night the train had climbed the huge Castilian plateau, had ground its way from the green Basque valleys, higher and higher into Old Castile. There were long pauses : at Burgos, at Valladolid and Medina del Campo ; there were impassioned farewells and elaborate salutations at corridor windows in the small hours. The train roared on into the southern night, wound round cataracts of rock and the dried beds of rivers. And then against the skyline the city of Saint Teresa rose paper-white in the dawn to crown its hill with many towers.

Dizzy with sleep, we clambered down and stepped across the rails into the dimly-lit station. Colour was returning ; it flooded the sky and striped the posters that announced forthcoming bullfights. " *Si, si, Señor,*" cried the porter. He seized our suitcases and swung them aloft. " *Avila de los Caballeros !*" He grinned, pointed to the distance, and trundled his hand-cart over the paving stones. The town slept on in the rose-fire of dawn, one's footsteps echoed emptily along the narrow, twisting streets—streets that were like stone corridors. The porter stopped before a door in a wall and clapped his hands. Nothing happened. There followed another outburst of clapping, and down the cobbled hill came the night-watchman, rattling his keys. The door was unlocked, and I stepped into a small courtyard. A flight of stairs led up to the hotel entrance, and there in the lighted doorway stood *Señora Miranda*. Muffled in a wrapper, her hair pinned to the top of her head, and her hands extended in a gesture of welcome, she had the resigned air of one doomed to witness a perpetual series of arrivals and departures. " Ah, how very, very tired you must be after that long journey ! " Without doubting her sincerity, it was evident that she had used some such phrase for many years. Drawing her wrapper round her, she waved us gently onwards into a tiled hall, urged us towards a wall sofa where, beneath a panel that depicted a glowing *señorita* gazing at a representation of dead poultry we drank thick black coffee. The hall evidently served as lounge and general meeting place, and had a certain austerity which the owner had tried to dispel by an arrangement of potted plants, balanced precariously upon bamboo tables or suspended by means of chains from the ceiling.

Awakened at midday by a murmuration of many voices, I sprang out of bed and threw back the shutters. The enclosed balcony with its scrolled ironwork hung over the street, almost touched the heads of the people crowding towards the fruit and flower market at the top of the hill. Those going up met and mingled with those coming down, and above the tumult was heard the exhortation of the blind man, who was selling lottery tickets at the street corner. After a late Spanish luncheon we sat in the hotel garden, a sanded square crushed between the fortification of the cathedral wall and a blur of red, frilled roofs. It was intensely hot and still ; the façade of the hotel hung like a painted backcloth in the sunlight, its shutters closed for the siesta that lay heavily upon the town. Olimpia, the waitress, stood on the railed-off platform that served as terrace, and fingered the tortoiseshell comb in her hair.

The voices of the street had given place to an occasional shuffle of rope-soled canvas shoes, or the creak of cart-wheels ; then the ring of silence would again enclose us, silence that was presently broken by a faint swishing, and a short, plump figure wreathed in cigar smoke emerged from behind the hedge of bamboos. An elderly man in a floppy straw hat, he held an empty watering-can in one hand and a bunch of zinnias in the other. " *Buenos días,*" he said, and his heavy, contused face remained pensive and unsmiling, closed-up, as at first sight appeared to be the case with so many Castilian countenances. With seigniorial dignity he explained that he was the husband of *Señora Miranda*. Ah, so we were English ? Not many foreigners came to the hotel nowadays—there were certain difficulties, yes, difficulties ; a sprinkling of French yes, one or two Americans even, but that was all. It was different in the old days when life was not so hard. Spain was being punished, and the punishment was terrible. He lifted his shoulders and contemplated the watering-can. Well, we must see for ourselves, here in Castile, the traditional, the true Spain. He clapped his hands for Olimpia to come and refill the can. " Yes, that is so, the true Spain," he repeated, as Olimpia carried off the can to the house. " To-day now it is the *Feria*; that is something you should see. It is what you may call a cattle-fair, and the farmers and peasants come in for miles round the province. It is an occasion when many an old mule is made to look young *Señores*." And raising two yellow-stained fingers to his hat-brim, he returned to ruminant among the bamboos.

The ring of silence dwindled, and at once a hundred sounds broke loose. In the dazzling light of late afternoon I walked down to the main plaza that was set like a great open stage for processions and fiestas. The wind from the sierra clutched and tugged at the café awnings, stirred the dust along the arcaded pavement where the tourists clustered. Here were little shops that exhibited filigree

brooches from Salamanca, picture postcards of sequined torreadors, and trays of quince paste. Running down jerkily from the plaza the streets and lanes straggled out beyond the walls to pile themselves above the brown-flecked deserts of the Campo—a landscape rubbed threadbare, scorched and dust-laden in summer, frozen in winter, and stretching towards sharp, bare hills. The medieval houses ran out over rocks, and built into the stones were cabins where the doors were wide open and old women sat sewing in the shade.

I descended from the hilltop that was crowded with churches, monasteries and convents and where the air was thick with prayers ; the walls rose like lion-coloured cliffs, enclosing the town in a flourish of towers and gateways. Rocks glinted with pin-points of light, colours ran together, the path fell steeply among boulders. Below the walls where bridge and flour mill marked the river bank the road showed moving patterns of human beings and animals. On they came slowly rounding the curves, plodding along the scooped-out channel of the road, the men in black, dusty corduroys astride donkeys or walking in groups, the women piled into mule-carts, and the children scampering beside the wheels or running on ahead. Strung out across the surrounding plain were other processions of carts and wagons all moving towards the long field beside the river.

Along the fringe of the field and grouped slightly apart from the sellers of pumpkins and melons, the Gipsies had set up their booths—nomad shrines redolent of the fortune-teller waiting behind a ragged curtain, or the stew-pot suspended over crackling twigs—a background that was like the shifting colours of the mountains. Close by were ranged the wine vendors with their sour-smelling tables, and the stalls where one could buy sunflower seeds and coloured drinks that tasted of thunder. Here and there a cloaked figure emphasized the solemn tempo of this country *Feria*, the repetition of an ancient pattern that had grown out of the stony earth, that belonged to the mountain *pueblo* rather than the walled town of the plain. One became merged in the crowd, one's foreignness forgotten as the life of the countryside was gathered up and displayed with that vividness and intensity characteristic of the Spanish temperament.

It was a scene which (to the northern imagination at least) called for castanets and a little dancing, the snapping of fingers in staccato rhythm ; but the business of buying and selling, of appraising pigs, goats and sheep appeared to be a ritual in itself, a ritual that demanded the utmost concentration as well as patience and politeness. Peasant farmers clustered in the centre of the field, pausing now and then to argue and gesticulate, to drive a bargain ; they moved cautiously across the fair ground for, pressing in from all sides, were the encampments of the muleteers and herdsmen—striped blankets improvised on poles and draped in the semblance of tents. Here whole

families would gather at night, sleeping beside their animals until daylight streaked the slopes of the Sierra de Gredos and the toneless invocation of a church bell sounded from behind the town walls. Along the river bank small boys were performing cartwheels and occasionally pursuing a pig that would escape squealing from the crowd. There were appreciative cries of "*Ole ! Ole !*" from spectators clustered on the bridge, and an old man became so enthusiastic that he began to practise long-range spitting into the water.

Grape-coloured clouds were swarming over the wall of mountains and blotting out the sun ; the sky was suffused with a dull red glow, and the wind suddenly springing up over the plain stung the face with gritty dust. "*La tormenta !*" cried the children, as they ran towards the muleteers' tents. "*Manuel ! Juanita ! Antonio ! Mercedes !*" screamed a dozen distracted voices, and all at once the Feria broke up in confusion. Under the lashing strings of the rain the crowd began to stampede this way and that, some making for the scattered cabins at the entrance to the town, others hurrying towards the Gipsy-booths.

"A summer storm, *Señor*, it will pass," said a woman, as she paused beside one of the melon stalls. A reddish cloud of dust floated from the track that bordered the fair ground where a *cortège* of mules and horses was moving towards the bridge. "You'll see, they'll be back in quarter of an hour. I know these storms." With superb gesture of disdain she flung a cloak over one shoulder, then danced at the mountain range now swollen and empurpled. Flamingo wings of lightning flashed down the sky. "Fire on the sierra !" said the woman. She pointed to a distant hillside where a tiny finger of flame flickered against a background of rock. "See ! Ah, yes, sometimes they blaze all night those summer fires—the ground's like tinder. I live up there and I know. It's all one can do to scratch a living at Pimpollar these days, I can tell you. Well, but merciful heaven, now there's some rain, we must be thankful for small blessings as I often tell my boy Paco. Yes, that's him waiting over there with our new mule, the one we managed to buy at the Feria. Go with good *Señor*."

As I climbed the stony ways into the town the plain became a sea of bright amber, the thunder rolled away over the Campo, the mountains emerged from their pall of cloud. The storm was over. In the great square the swallows were darting against a violet sky, the empty cafés were flickering into life. One drank chocolate, a sick, oily liquid that was too sweet. It was the hour of the *peritif*, of gossip that had been bottled all day and was now to be sipped in the dusk ; the hour, too, of the evening saunter when shopkeepers and nursemaids came out to sniff the air of the hilltop

after the storm, and to linger in the Alameda. A world of small town life humming upon balconies or at street corners, or murmuring behind the massive iron grilles. Then, as at a given signal, the Gipsies gathered in small groups along the arcaded pavement—a chorus that muttered incomprehensible asides, that all at once broke off and streamed away to the other end of the town, the men walking together the women dragging their children after them, and leaving the dusky plaza to the tourists and the beggars.

THE WEATHER HOUSE

BY DENISE FOLLIOT

Under one roof and linked together
They swing and sway, slaves of the weather ;
He in the sun, she in the rain—
A moment's respite, then back again.

For each there is a different sky,
A different climate, wet or dry ;
For every movement a different reason,
A longing for a different season.

Yet they do not fly apart,
Firmly joined heart to heart,
Not bound by intimate affection
But by their mutual rejection.

So, when you laugh I must fret
Over moments you forget,
And your tenderness decries
The sun that warms me from your eyes.

How to meet on common ground
As we pull each other round ?
How stabilize the undefined
And complex climate of the mind ?

THE CULT OF SHERLOCK HOLMES

BY G. F. McCLEARY

TO many of London's visitors this summer, one of the chief places of interest will be the inner of two rooms in Baker Street, fitted up by the St. Marylebone Borough Council as a memorial to one of the borough's most illustrious residents—Mr. Sherlock Holmes. There the devotees of this great man may see the strange objects, described in *The Musgrave Ritual*, that throw light on his rare personality ; the Persian slipper in which he kept his tobacco, the unanswered correspondence transfixated by a jack-knife into the wooden mantelpiece, the wall with the "patriotic V.R. done in bullet-pocks" by him in his domestic pistol practice. The place, in short, is a reconstruction of the sitting-room occupied by Holmes in Mrs. Hudson's house, No. 221B, Baker Street.

But, you may say, Sherlock Holmes never really lived ; he is but a figment of a novelist's imagination. It depends upon what you mean by "lived". Many people have taken him to be a man of flesh and blood. Conan Doyle, in his *Memories and Adventures*, tells that when visiting the French front in the 1914-1918 war he dined with General Humbert, the commanding officer, who, fixing him with piercing eyes asked : "*Sherlock Holmes, est-ce qu'il est un soldat dans l'armée anglaise ?*" The whole table waited in dead silence for the answer. The creator of Holmes was equal to the occasion. "*Mais, mon Général,*" he replied, "*il est trop vieux pour service.*" It is also recorded that a party of French schoolboys visiting London, when asked what they wished to see first, unanimously replied : "Mr. Holmes's lodgings in Baker Street."

In another sense Holmes is a living creature. "He lives", writes Louis Untermeyer in *Profile by Gaslight*, "and will live longer than those of us who wear the gross and impermanent clothing of flesh." He is the most widely celebrated character that has appeared in literature since the great days of Charles Dickens—nay, according to Alexander Woollcott, since the coming of Don Quixote. His fame has crossed the barriers of language, nationality, race, and ideology. In *The Times* of September 28, 1946, it was stated that the Red Army library editors had recommended Sherlock Holmes to the soldiers as "the exterminator of crimes and evils, and a model of magnificent strength of thought and great culture." In America there is a flourishing society, The Baker Street Irregulars of New

York, with affiliated societies in over 40 cities of the Union, dedicated to "keeping green the memory of Sherlock Holmes." Its meetings are subject to regulations, formulated by Mr. Elmer Davis, which provide, *inter alia*, that a round of liquid refreshment shall be the financial responsibility of any member who fails to identify, by title of document and context, any quotation from the Holmes chronicles propounded by another member. It is also provided that at all meetings the anthem of the Irregulars, *The Road to Baker Street*, shall be sung to the tune of *The Road to Mandalay*.

Such being the devotion inspired by Sherlock Holmes, it is not surprising that the chronicles of his exploits should be subjected to a minute and searching textual criticism. The pioneer in this field of modern scholarship is Monsignor Ronald Knox, whose first contribution, the essay *Studies in the Literature of Sherlock Holmes*, was communicated to the Gryphon Club at Trinity College, Oxford, in 1911, and published in his book, *Essays in Satire*, in 1928. He pointed out that each of the Holmes chronicles contains a certain number of special components, to each of which he gave an appropriate name. There are eleven of these, but only in one chronicle, *A Study in Scarlet*, are they all to be found. The first he named the *Prooimion*, "a homely Baker Street scene, with invaluable personal touches, and sometimes a demonstration by the detective"; the second is the *Exegesis kata ton diakonta*, "the client's statement of the case", and the third, the *Ichneusis*, "or personal investigation". Monsignor Knox pointed out that there were various inconsistencies in the texts. For instance, in *The Man with the Twisted Lip*, Mrs. Watson refers to her husband, Dr. John H. Watson, as "James". He mentioned also "a special kind of epigram, the *Sherlockismus*", giving as an example this quotation from *Silver Blaze*:

Let me call your attention to the curious incident of the dog in the night-time.

"The dog did nothing at all in the night-time."

"That was the curious incident," said Sherlock Holmes.

The next outstanding contribution to Holmesian scholarship was made by Mr. S. C. Roberts in his booklet, *Dr. Watson*, published in 1931. He demonstrated that Watson, who had married Miss Morstan in 1887 (or in 1888, the date is a matter of controversy), made a second marriage in 1902. This revelation, as Miss Dorothy L. Sayers put it in her book, *Unpopular Opinions*, "created a literary sensation only equalled in recent times by . . . the publication of Charlotte Brontë's love-letters to M. Héger." Evidence of the second marriage may be found in *The Blanched Soldier*, one of the two chronicles written by Holmes himself. Opening this case, he wrote:

I find from my notebook that it was in January, 1903, just after the conclusion of the Boer War . . . The good Watson had at that time deserted me for a wife, the

only selfish action which I can recall in our association.

Holmes evidently resented Watson's incursions into matrimony. In *The Sign of Four*, Watson records that when he told Holmes that Miss Morstan had accepted him as a husband, the great man gave "a most dismal groan" and said : "I feared as much."

Mr. H. W. Bell, continuing the discussion of Watson's matrimonial experiences, has maintained that the 1902 marriage was not the second but the third, and that the second took place in 1896.* The reasons advanced for this view, though obviously based upon a most painstaking study of the relevant texts, have, with equal learning, been controverted by Miss Dorothy Sayers, and are not generally accepted by Holmesian scholars. Mr. Bell has, however, made an important contribution to the disputed question of the date of Watson's first marriage, upon which the chronology of *The Sign of Four* depends. Monsignor Knox and Mr. T. S. Blakeney have contended that this event took place in 1888 †; but Mr. Bell, in a able argument, has shown that the right year was 1887. This view is taken also by Mr. Roberts and H. Desmond MacCarthy.‡

The Holmes texts have been scrutinized for data from which inferences might be drawn throwing light upon the education and early life of the great detective. Miss Dorothy Sayers has put forward reasons for inferring that Holmes was a Cambridge man. Her case, based chiefly upon *The Gloria Scott* and *The Musgrave Ritual*, establishes the high probability that Holmes was an undergraduate at either Oxford or Cambridge, and continues with an argument that may be summarized thus : (1) In an early stage of his University career, Holmes on his way to his college chapel was bitten by a bulldog. (2) Since dogs are not allowed in the colleges of Oxford or Cambridge, Holmes must at that time have been living in lodgings in the town. (3) Oxford undergraduates live in lodgings in the later stages of their university career ; Cambridge undergraduates in the earlier. Miss Sayers argues also, that Holmes was born in 1853, went up to Cambridge in 1871, took the Natural Sciences Tripos in 1874, and went to live in Montague Street, London, in 1876. She mentions also various circumstances leading to the conclusion that his college at Cambridge was Sidney Sussex.

Students of the various Holmesian texts may put the extent and accuracy of their knowledge to the proof by referring to one, or both, of the two examination papers set for the purpose, one by Mr. E. V. Knox, the other by Mr. Ivor Gunn. The former first

* H. W. Bell, *Sherlock Holmes and Dr. Watson*.

† R. A. Knox, *Essays in Satire*, p. 155 ; T. S. Blakeney, *Sherlock Holmes : Fact or Fiction ?*, 65-64.

‡ H. W. Bell, "The Date of *The Sign of Four*", *Baker Street Studies*, pp. 203-219 ; S. C. Roberts, op. cit., pp. 16-18 ; Desmond MacCarthy, *The Listener*, December 14, 1929. Mr. Bell also contends that Watson first met Miss Morstan in September 1887. In the *National Review* of October 1946, I gave reasons for concluding that the right month was July 1887.

appeared in the number of *Punch* for October 31, 1928, and both are reprinted in Mr. Starrett's book, *The Private Life of Sherlock Holmes*. Both papers are modelled on the historic *Pickwick Examination Paper* set for the undergraduates of Christ's College Cambridge by C. S. Calverley in 1857, the winner of the first prize being Sir Walter Besant, and of the second, Professor Skeat.

Bibliography

- Essays in Satire.* R. A. Knox. 1928.
Dr. Watson. S. C. Roberts. 1931.
Sherlock Holmes and Dr. Watson. H. W. Bell. 1932.
Sherlock Holmes : Fact or Fiction ? T. S. Blakeney. 1932.
Baker Street Studies. Edited by H. W. Bell. 1934.
The Private Life of Sherlock Holmes. Vincent Starrett. 1934.
221B : Studies in Sherlock Holmes. Edited by Vincent Starrett. 1940.
Profile by Gaslight. Edited by Edgar W. Smith. 1944.
Unpopular Opinions. Dorothy L. Sayers. 1946.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of THE FORTNIGHTLY.

Sir,

May I be permitted to correct two statements of fact contained in the Rev. B. G. Plowright's review of my *Introduction to Social Psychology*? Writing in THE FORTNIGHTLY of May 1951, he alleges that the following sentence : "The thoughts in our minds permit us to remember past and to anticipate future anticipations," occurs in my book. In point of fact, I write on p. 13 : "In man, the aims and objects of his instincts can be expressed in words and become associated with ideas. The thoughts in our minds permit us to remember past, and to anticipate future, satisfactions. In his day-dreams, man can imagine the most splendid satisfactions of his various wishes."

Mr. Plowright has removed the sentence from its context and replaced the word "satisfactions" by "anticipations". This double distortion permits him to argue that the writer of the quoted sentence "is dealing with ideas that are not wholly familiar to himself." I agree with this conclusion, but the sentence to which he refers has been framed, not by me, but by himself.

Equally misleading is the following statement which he also imputes to me : "(The way) chosen by the individual depends on several innate and environmental factors." Mr. Plowright has taken these words from a passage in which I discuss three types of newspaper readers and three different ways of dealing with an unconscious phantasy. I then go on to say : "Which of these ways is chosen by the individual depends on several innate and environmental factors, the most important of which are those that affect the individual in the first five years of his life. Bearing in mind that there are at least three different ways or mechanisms of dealing with the same phantasy, we shall now examine . . ." (p. 25).

By substituting "The way" for the words "Which of these ways" and by isolating a fraction of a sentence, Mr. Plowright conveys the impression that I have naively expressed a platitude—*Cui bono?*

Yours faithfully,

London, W.1.

OTTO FRIEDMAN.

THE FORTNIGHTLY LIBRARY

WHAT OF LIBERTY ?

BY OWEN HICKEY

THE politician has triumphed over the don in Mr. Gordon Walker. The characteristics of both are displayed in his book* but the former predominate. The theories of western political thought get a critical airing and the author has his own contribution to make to the theory of the "natural" origin and development of the state, but even these passages echo the urgency of an orator and pamphleteer, and lack the rigour of a more academic study. The gain is a vigorous, if monotonous, style.

Like other writers before him Mr. Gordon Walker sees western society on downward declivity with a precipice ahead. It must turn aside or else go over. His diagnosis of this predicament is new and interesting. On the theoretical side he attributes it to Cartesian metaphysics and the political philosophies it has given rise to. Socially it is due to the habits and cast of mind of "Cartesian man" whose two chief failures seem to be insatiable acquisitiveness and an ungrounded belief in the possibility of exact knowledge and consequent control of his environment. Thus Descartes is exhibited once again as the evil genius of western civilization. Professor Ryle having held him responsible for our muddle about minds, Mr. Gordon Walker blames him for the mess society is in. It is a graver charge for this is more than muddle, it is "mortal crisis". We are, he argues, in a dilemma either horn of which will pitch us into intolerable tyranny. Society may be organized on the principle of Lockean individualism, but if so it will not work for long; booms and slumps, unemploy-

ment, violence, "the flight from freedom" and tyranny will surely come. Or it may be organized according to Marxian or Hegelian ideologies, but this is to embrace tyranny in an incontinent fashion. Both principles have their roots in the Cartesian duality of *res extensa* and *res cogitans*. Either individuals are made of *res cogitans*, as Locke held, autonomous, with inalienable liberties, entering into society to improve their property—a view which rules out satisfactory co-operation from the start—or *res cogitans* is assimilated into *res extensa*, as Hobbes would have it and individuals become conscripts in the "army of unalterable law"—a view which leads to totalitarianism. Those are the horns. There is no safety to be found in steering between them (we are not told very fully why not). The solution lies in a third way which breaks out of the Cartesian dilemma altogether.

The reader's intelligence is by this time stimulated with curiosity as to what this third way might be; his emotions are also to be aroused before either are satisfied. A hundred pages are spent in tracing the growth of this Cartesian "second nature", by giving an eclectic account of changing western manners and morals and the societies that gave rise to them, in which the author leans heavily on Norbert Elias and Lewis Mumford, ending in a colourful account of the present day depravity of Cartesian man. "He defiantly glories in sin and winks at evil"; he becomes "increasingly attracted by brutality"; "in peace-time . . . (he) is repossessed by his fears and phobias, his neuroses and

* Restatement of Liberty, by P. C. Gordon Walker, M.P. Hutchinson 21s.

his hatreds", but "the machine, his unique creature, fills him with a dread of the war for which he harbours a secret and sinful welcome." (It is significant that it is *man* and not *men* that is under discussion. One never meets *man*, only *men*; and though one may have heard of men like these the description hardly seems to fit the Cartesian man in the street.)

After all this, the third way, which lies in the creation of a "better society" with new functions for the State, peopled by "better men", sounds a little flat. The chief reforms are that men shall replace their desire for accumulating private wealth by a desire to co-operate for social ends; the State shall exert social pressure to bring about this change in human nature, the impetus coming from the workers. It shall arrogate more powers to itself and create new offences, such as the misuse of wealth; it shall increase taxation and exercise complete economic control (though the planning will be of scarcity not of plenty, so well has the lesson of the age been learnt). On the other hand, it will guarantee a sphere of privacy for each individual in which he may misconduct himself if he so wills; there shall be no interference that is not relevant to the objectives of economic planning and social pressure. Social security, full employment and a government changeable by the party system will of course be there. More interesting than the question of whether this picture is self-consistent or realizable, is the justification Mr. Gordon Walker gives for it. It is not only that he thinks this is the only alternative to ruin but, like other political philosophers, he claims that his way is the "natural" way for society to function. His theory of society is, sketchily, as follows. Men do not associate by accident nor for profit but because if they did not they would not be men. The three marks that distinguish them from brutes are speech, reason and the sense of "sin" (by which misnomer he means a sense of shortcoming, of failing to achieve ideals). These are only

possible in association with their fellows. If they do not associate they thereby cease to be men. The traditional "state of nature" is a chimera. In society a man acquires a "second nature" which is the form that his particular society gives to these basic capacities. It is acquired first of all in the social nursery, during nonage, but after graduation it must be maintained by social pressure which acts as a compulsion on men to control their irrational tendencies. The more developed the second nature of the society the greater its social pressure must be. The "social energy" which exerts this pressure and keeps society ticking over, so to speak, comes from the energy of the individual members of the society and some of it must be tapped for social ends. It seems to be a law of this form of energy that the greater the pressure the more of it is generated. "The generation and direction of social energy is the fundamental necessity of society and so its own justification." This part of Mr. Gordon Walker's argument is summary and obscure, and it seems particularly exposed to the general objections to mechanistic thinking which he deploys at such length elsewhere. He should have elucidated this crucial section of his book. For the broad justification of his "better State" is that it generates increased social energy, and confers added rationality on its members.

And what of liberty? The restatement is of Plato's doctrine that freedom consists in control of the passionate elements in man and the exercise of rational decision. The State confers freedom in so far as its pressure is towards the control of the passions. The more of this sort of pressure the more freedom. What Mr. Gordon Walker adds to this doctrine is that for rationality to be possible the factors bearing on a decision must be predictable. This is more hinted at than elaborated. It is clear that he considers conditions of economic slump and unemployment as inimical to rationality because sound calculations are not

possible. Poverty likewise extinguishes it. He does not consider the cases of a St. Francis or a Diogenes. War in one place is quoted as removing the conditions which make rationality possible, and in another as giving scope for it. On the whole it comes out that the circumstances of their lives must be predictable and secure for men to enjoy rationality and therefore freedom. There are such obvious *prima facie* objections to this doctrine of liberty that Mr. Gordon Walker should have provided it with a more organized defence.

THE LIFE OF JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN, Vol IV : 1901-1903, by Julian Amery. Macmillan. 30s.

In 533 pages of skilful narrative and analysis Mr. Amery has covered the course of events which raised Chamberlain to the height of his fame, not of his power, and then left him precariously poised on the edge of the tariff reform controversy. In the autumn of 1901 Chamberlain stood out among his contemporaries on account of both the largeness of his ideas "an extraordinary man—quite absolutely on the big lines," Milner called him—and the vigour of his personality. "He moves with the force of a steam puncher manufacturing vents. But every bit of the machinery tells. There is no waste and the driving power never ceases." By the end of 1902, as a result of his cabaret, the accession of Balfour, and the political disaster to Liberal Unionism "the Education Bill, he appeared most as an isolated figure among English politicians, a man driven irresistibly to take a new course, and to take it at the wrong time, his prudence declining as self-confidence ebb."

The scale of Garvin's original enterprise leaves Mr. Amery with plenty of space to examine minutely Chamberlain's motives and tactics. Unfortunately Chamberlain was not the sort of

person who prepared his papers for posterity. It was not only that he had no time to care about the future: it was that with his quick mind and his shrewd eye for openings, paper was dangerous to him. The Chamberlain papers tell us nothing of Chamberlain's reflections at the end of the Boer War, of his conversations concerning a German alliance and of his shift away from it, of his discussions with Milner in South Africa, or of his inner conflicts and dreams at the end of 1902. Mr. Amery has had to depend largely on the evidence of others or on conjecture. The conjecture is often subtle and always far more frank, particularly in its account of party dealings, than Garvin's sugar-coated conjecture in the earlier volumes of this biography, but so long as so much depends on conjecture, opinions about Chamberlain will continue to differ widely. Even after studying Mr. Amery's lively account of Chamberlain's skill in changing issues, diverting rebellions, fixing meetings and framing campaigns, the reader may well feel that the *Westminster Gazette* cartoon, "Joseph before the Sphinx", bearing the caption: "Really! what a family likeness!", remains a tantalizingly apposite comment.

The answers to the riddle of the sphinx lies not so much in Chamberlain's personality, to which Mr. Amery certainly gives too much weight in foreign affairs, as in the conditions and attitudes of his times. The movements from social reform to imperialism and from imperialism to tariff reform reflected pressures, which a "natural dictator" had to learn to understand. During the political crisis of the Education Bill, which undermined the Liberal Unionist party, the radical fires in Chamberlain barely smouldered. "Why could we not "let it alone", and leave the reform of primary education to our successors?" asked the one-time pioneer of the National Education League. This was more like philosophic Conservatism of the Salisbury variety than a gospel of action,

even of conservative action, yet in his restless attempt to escape from his corner, Chamberlain created more divisions in the ranks of Unionism than even the Education Bill had done. Thinking out new lines of action, Chamberlain accepted a stop on social expenditure in order to push forward Imperial Union, and this seemed to him like a policy of "construction", but the abandonment of social reform let in militant Liberalism, and the dread of the dear loaf slashed the "great party of union" into shreds before it had time to be born. All this was implicit in the future, when Chamberlain made his choice in the winter of 1902-1903, and, by the time he had chosen, as Mr. Amery says, "the roots of his power were beginning to decay." There remained the dramatic climaxes, which Mr. Amery will describe in the concluding volume of this indispensable biography.

ASA BRIGGS

GEORGE WYNDHAM: A Study in Toryism, by John Biggs-Davison. *Hodder and Stoughton.* 18s.

Mr. Biggs-Davison, writing well and vividly, links George Wyndham's Toryism with past and present politics. Wyndham's life was lived between 1863 and 1913. His biographer's political thesis is illuminated by a valuable reminder of the conscience, ideals and work of one whose personality inevitably holds the main interest, with the picture of him and of the setting of his life and its opportunities.

He was born a romantic of romantic ancestry. Incredibly handsome and variously gifted, he had on his father's side great English Wyndham tradition; on his mother's, that of his great-grandfather, Lord Edward FitzGerald, the romantic Irish rebel whom he closely resembled. In an age that has seen the final disappearance of Wyndham's world—one of freedom from material burdens for full expenditure otherwise of gifts—this picture appears one of a

Prince Charming in a fairy castle setting, from which he rode out to do battle for his dreams. "Man of arms, of State and of letters," and countryman. "The last of the English Knights," Chesterton called him. Brought up by his mother on the tradition of Lord Edward, Ireland drew Wyndham from childhood to the passionate love that finally broke his career of brilliant promise and his heart. Having been secretary to Arthur Balfour during Balfour's Irish Chief Secretaryship, in 1900 Wyndham himself became Chief Secretary for Ireland, saw the 1903 Land Act carried, fought vainly in a thorny field for a Catholic university (two Irish projects of King Edward's personal interest) and met the traditional fate of Ireland's lovers, on the Devolution rock to which others steered the ship, unknown to him.

In Wyndham's crowded personal life, all the full cup was his to drink and share—to exhaustion point and his early death. The intense Wyndham family love was accompanied by a genius for friendship. Statesmen, men and women of letters—to which fraternity he belonged—were only among those many in his generous, catholic friendship, and deep in it were the English country people, who were part of his love for England, and the Irish peasants, who loved Lord Edward's descendant as he loved them and to whose happiness his Land Act made, perhaps, the greatest contribution in Anglo-Irish history.

A king's man and churchman, a High Anglican, he married happily Sibell, Countess Grosvenor, who shared his faith and dreams. At Saughton, when their friends gathered there were music, reading aloud, tennis, riding and laughter and talk, delight in children and all humanities. With the Wyndhams' French and Celtic blood, their conversation was French in its mountain-climbing pursuit of the peak of a thought. "Hunting all day and reading all night," was delight to a splendid horseman. Galloping alone over English downs, he would recite

cloud "The Ballad of the White Horse".

Mr. Biggs-Davison traces, with admirable clarity, the political record and the personal romance of this life, recreating that brilliant Irish Chief Secretaryship in which Wyndham moved, a prince with royal prerogatives of patronage. He died before the war which he foresaw could end his world and the brief life of his only son. That great atonement, the Wyndham Land Act, which created a country of peasant proprietors and reversed the fundamental wrong of Anglo-Irish history—and confiscation—was the monument of a Chief Secretary descended from the Norman FitzGeralds, who were among the first twelfth-century land grabbers in Ireland.

PAMELA HINKSON

THE HISTORY OF THE XII ROYAL LANCERS, by Captain P. F. Stewart, M.C. *Geoffrey Cumberlege; Oxford University Press.* 30s.

Among the oldest cavalry regiments in the British army, the XII Lancers were raised in 1715 at a time when the story of Marlborough's armies had ready had two years in which to be forgotten—time enough for the red coat to have become again, in the best English tradition "a mark for any dignity and loathing." Immediately after its formation the regiment, then the XII Dragoons, disappeared into the obscurity of eighteenth-century Ireland, from which it did not emerge for another 5 years. Captain Stewart's account of these early years displays a state of efficiency and corruption in the army which makes it seem a miracle that we can even a minor engagement during that century.

When the regiment left Ireland in 1793 Europe was already ablaze. Of the British forces in Flanders, a report by Dundas of that year read: "Your army is destroyed—that is to say the men are. The officers and their baggage are safe"—a state of affairs which did not suggest that the British

army was in any condition in which to meet the Revolution. Yet within the next few years the regiment saw service in Corsica, Italy and Portugal and was already taking its part in the resurgence of the British army.

In his account of the part played by the XII Lancers in Egypt, at Walcheren, in the Peninsula and at Waterloo, Captain Stewart has drawn not only on regimental sources but on existing military histories from Fortescue onwards—but his best material comes from personal letters and journals. A Lieutenant Caton wrote from Egypt in 1801:

Three officers lived in a soldiers' tent formed to catch every ray of heat, and for the first three weeks we were without that comfort; at all times we slept in our cloaks in the sands, overrun with scorpions, centipedes, tarantulas, and a thousand other noxious reptiles, never without our clothes except to change, nor any other bed but a rough mat . . . salt pork, biscuit, rum and water for breakfast, for dinner, for everything.

How easily might that same letter have been written by Lieutenant Caton's successors 140 years later.

After 1815 the XII Lancers were in action whenever England was at war. Few regiments could claim a fuller share of the King's service. Captain Stewart writes with equal vigour of the peacetime years of regimental soldiering and his pages are enlivened by descriptive flashes which are a characteristic of the book. There is the Nizam in India in the '80s who was entertained one evening by the officers giving a display of pig sticking by moonlight—mounted on bullocks. We are not told what he thought of the entertainment. And there is the unfortunate subaltern who had to get up at four in the morning and ride off to the race-course with his captain, where he held the watch while his senior rode "20 miles round and round the race-course on relays of troop horses for exercise."

Perhaps most surprising is the story of the regimental scandal of the '70s, in which two sergeants absconded with

the takings of the sergeants' mess. Having spent the money the two returned, were tried by court-martial and reduced to the ranks. But mysteriously the finding of the court-martial was not confirmed by the Inspector-General of Cavalry and the two offenders were reinstated in their rank, but junior on the list. Meanwhile the R.Q.M.S. had been ordered, by a curious justice, to make good the deficit and had committed suicide ; whereupon one of the two sergeants (named Normington) was promoted in his place. "The oddest thing of the whole unhappy business," writes the author, "was that Normington was the Inspector-General's god-son." It says much for regimental pride and tradition that the morale of the unit does not appear to have suffered seriously in the following years.

GORDON WINTER.

THE CITY OF LONDON : A Record of Destruction and Survival, with a report on reconstruction by the Planning Consultants, C. H. Holden and W. G. Holford. Improvements and Town Planning Committee of the Corporation of London. Architectural Press. 25s.

LONDON CITY CHURCHES, 1951 :
A Brief Guide, by Gerald Cobb. **The Old Wall of the City of London**, by Norman Cook, Keeper of the Guildhall Museum. **Discoveries in Walbrook, 1949-50** (Guildhall Museum publication). **Rebuilding the City of London**, by H. Anthony Mealand, City Planning Officer. *The City Corporation*, 1s. each.

A work with the sub-title "A Record of Destruction and Survival" may be expected confidently to justify the description when issued under the authority of the City Corporation. One of the grievous losses of the war was the destruction or damage done to many of Wren's or his pupils' churches. What happened to them ? The answer is difficult to discover here. A record is given of eight churches destroyed, 20

damaged, 11 recommended for rebuilding, and one to be used as a choir school, out of 47 surviving in 1939. But there is no ready means of checking these figures by reference to individual churches, nor of obtaining a detailed picture both of survivals and losses. This has to be built up, and then incompletely, in a paragraph in the consultants' "Final Report".

Fortunately another Corporation publication gives the facts we are in search of. Mr. Gerald Cobb, whose *Old Churches of London* (1948), is far the best recent work on the subject, has summarized it and brought it up to date in *London City Churches*, 1951, issued in association with the Friends of the City Churches. A two-page pictorial map shows all the towers and spires of the City as they existed before the bombing began ; and drawings of the whole of Wren's steeples are reproduced from the larger work.

The large volume here also needs to be supplemented, and in some cases amended, by further Corporation shillingsworths. *Discoveries in Walbrook*, 1949-50, records the important but unhappily fragmentary results of the rescue work of the Guildhall Museum staff on one of the most promising sites in all London—fragmentary because it was done under the hazards of giant cranes overhead ; promising because this was part of the earliest Roman London.

The Old Wall of the City of London gives the results up to the end of last year of the work directed by Mr. W. F. Grimes for the Roman and Medieval London Excavation Council. The discovery of traces of a substantial military fort at the point where the wall turns obliquely, west of Noble Street and North of Gresham Street, implies a rewriting of the accepted story of the Roman defences. Adequate maps and illustrations render this the best recent guide, though only 20 pages altogether, to London Wall. *Rebuilding the City of London* gives a short summary of the plan of the consultants, but it also supplements

them because it is up-to-date. Again there is a plan of adequate size showing the war-damaged area. The numbered half-page map of the large volume compares badly with those in these smaller guides ; moreover its proposals for reconstruction as presented in the final report of the consultants is "as presented in 1947". It is now 1951.

Some qualifications must therefore be made in commending *The City of London : A Record of Destruction and Survival*. The plan of Dr. Holden and Professor Holford has been modified in some details ; other parts of its proposals have been postponed. We are assured, however, that developments are already taking place within its framework and that its outline will not be disturbed by the publication, at the end of this year, of the London County Council plan for the whole of Greater London. It may and must therefore be studied by everybody interested in the future shape of London.

The most interesting sections for the general reader are Part 2, "The Historical Background", and Part 4, "Pedestrian Ways" and "Progress towards Rebuilding." In part 4, the experts are on their own ground ; and it is made fascinating to those who are not experts with the help of wash drawings and photographs of proposed new views. These explain better than acres of letterpress how the ancient buildings of the City can play a part in the making of the new. In "The Historical Background" the writers, like nearly all their predecessors, are building on a shifting subsoil. A part of the record needing revision or amplification is the reference to the fort (called here a camp) discovered last year near Gresham Street. Again, the Bishop's Commission has just announced (*The Times*, June 2) a modification of its recommendations and added two to the churches to be restored. *The City of London* was already published ; thus there was no omission ; the fact however, illustrates the continual reshaping of London history.

The scope of the historical section

no doubt forbids archaeology, except incidentally ; its broad purpose is to show the development of London from its misty beginnings nineteen centuries ago to the age of motor traffic and the problems this presents. Subject to the criticism that some of the maps are reproduced on too small a scale, the illustration and mapping of the story are among the best features of the work. Old prints are used lavishly, with photographs from the middle of the nineteenth century. The photographs of bombed London could not easily be bettered ; imagination is shown in the choice of the pictures ; and beauty is seen clothing the devastated sites.

Slow as reconstruction has been in starting, it is well to go and see some of the ruins with their carpet of wild flowers before the builders get too busy. The Walbrook excavation, with its series of historic layers down to Roman foundation-piles in the peat, disappeared almost overnight. The City plan represents an attempt to preserve as well as reconstruct. Such an aim is subject to continual pressure from commercial and utilitarian needs, even more from traffic claims. It will demand courage and perseverance to maintain it.

W. THOMSON HILL

TUDOR RENAISSANCE, by James Lees-Milne. Batsford. 21s.

This splendidly illustrated book is a fascinating study of the first, hesitant manifestations of Renaissance influences in England, and Mr. Lees-Milne's purpose, as he says, "is to give . . . emphasis to the various foreign sources of the neo-classical style, so slowly and painfully adopted by this country over a long period, which actually outlasted the reign of Elizabeth."

The Renaissance in Italy had been in flower for over a century before it began to touch the lives of northern peoples. The French invasions of Italy by Charles VIII, Louis XII and Francis I hastened the spread of

Italian influences, and a persistently competitive relationship which existed between the English and French courts quickened English awareness of new French tendencies ; but in both countries classical developments made halting progress. In England, as in France, the Gothic tradition had been rooted as it had never been in Italy ; in Italy, the Roman tradition had been embedded as it had never been in England and France. It is not surprising then, as Mr. Lees-Milne points out, that, in the northern countries, "well over a hundred years were to elapse after the introduction of the classical before the Gothic traditions of building were to be dispelled from common usage." In England, furthermore, the Renaissance style, at first encouraged by Henry VIII, was later to be discountenanced by him when he contrived the final severance of the English church from Rome. Nevertheless, Torrigiani's handsome tomb of Henry VII in Westminster Abbey, and the exquisite screen, carved by anonymous craftsmen in King's College Chapel, Cambridge, are significant and compelling examples of Italian classicism which were produced during this brief, pre-Reformation period.

Thereafter, the Italian artists were replaced by artists from the Protestant north. "They were no more architects than their Catholic predecessors," Mr. Lees-Milne writes, "but craftsmen of all sorts, sometimes surveyors, masons, sculptors, joiners and painters . . ." So far, the professional architect had not yet appeared in England. There is little doubt that, in domestic building, until the end of the sixteenth century, the client, helped by pattern books, designed the broad plan of his own house and relied on the experienced skill of the masons, either foreign or native, or both, to carry it out in detail.

In the spate of Tudor house building, the influence of both Catholic and Protestant foreigners is assessed by Mr. Lees-Milne as "prodigious". A medley of incongruous elements were thrown together in defiance of all

notions of architectural propriety. Remnants of Gothic mingled with Italian idioms, French details and fragments from German and Flemish pattern books. Somehow or other, the foreign and native elements blended, often with an effect of persuasive charm ; but there was to be no unqualified acceptance of the classical Renaissance manner until the appearance of Inigo Jones in the seventeenth century. Mr. Lees-Milne's book, obviously the outcome of profound research, is a vivid and rewarding account of the eager improvisations of the early English Renaissance, and a scholarly description of its social and intellectual background.

F. W. WENTWORTH-SHEILDS.

WRITTEN WITH MY LEFT HAND,
by Nugent Barker. With a Foreword by Lord Gorell. *Percival Marshall.* 9s. 6d.

THE FACE OF INNOCENCE, by William Sansom. *The Hogarth Press.* 9s. 6d.

Several of Mr. Nugent Barker's distinguished, unusual tales will no doubt be known to the discriminating reader—certainly to connoisseurs of the short story in the period between the wars—for some of them have previously appeared in literary journals, including THE FORTNIGHTLY, and in E. J. O'Brien's *Selections of the Best Short Stories of the Year.* But how satisfactory to have at last in *Written With My Left Hand* this full, if belated, collection !

Mr. Barker's Muse is of imagination all compact, and what first strikes me is that his writing makes a quiet claim to be judged as literature. These 21 tales, of varying length, are all in Poe's phrase "on the margin", that is to say their subjects are outside normal experience, either macabre, singular, humorous, or fantastic. Each tale demands the fullest critical attention, but the best of them, such as "Curious Adventure of Mr. Bond", "The Six", "Whessoe", "The Spurs", "Gertie Macnamara", "Out of Leading-

Strings", "Mrs. Sayce's Guy", are too hauntingly realized to be easily forgotten. In "Whessoe", which describes a ghost whose "shrunken legs appeared as though they might drop at any moment from the loosely buckled ends of his knee-breeches", apart from the sibilant suggestion of the name, the very prose of the story becomes fluid and disembodied. For contrast there is this brief vigorous description of Monsieur Charbo. "He was big, he was fat, he was like a Périgord pig, he was like a shipped goose; his great beard was as black as a fried mushroom; and his lips were as thick and as pink as a couple of Alsace sausages." Charbo talks to Grégoire, a "little, meek man, with wrinkles in his voice."

Not all these stories are, of course, equal; and there might be reason to question the authenticity of some of the country dialect. Yet, even if this is so and if sometimes Mr. Barker's style is a trifle old-fashioned, his *mise-en-scènes* are often outside space and time—he is not trying to placate any temporary *Zeitgeist*. Here are delicate singular flavourings for the essentially literary palate.

Ever since I first met Mr. William Sansom's work in *South*, passing on to some of his other short stories and then to *The Body*, I have felt that he is probably the brightest hope of our younger writers in prose fiction. His work seems to me that of a born writer, in the way one would describe a painter as 'painterly', for he obviously loves his medium, words, and has a means of using them so sharply and newly that he is able to avoid even clichés of thought; so, in telling of what might be commonplace, he rivets our attention. I think *The Face of Innocence* is perhaps his best book so far. His heroine, Eve, soon comes to life: "She glittered at me, a glitter old as sin, the wise old glitter that forces an understanding between eyes, that burns down the curtains of convention. . ."

The story, told with great skill and attack, is of Harry Camberley, a marine

engineer of forty, and of the deepening mystery of Eve, the girl he marries. It is told by Harry's oldest friend, a novelist, who acts as confidant to both and later takes a holiday with them in the South of France and in Tunisia. While it may be that some of the minor characters, Martie and Barney for example, are slightly overdrawn, Mr. Sansom shows his usual lively and acutely sensitive interest in human nature, so that his three main characters absorbingly convince. We are led on from surprise to fresh surprise and in good time to the revelation of Eve's secret. There is a compelling tension, a dynamic horse-power behind this story that is entralling.

A word must be said about Mr. Sansom's descriptive writing. Seldom have I found pictures of the South of France and of North Africa so vivid. "Arab music whined from a radio back among the white geometry of house-shapes, a donkey brayed its rubber lament like an old motor-horn, camels frayed like weathered rope splayed past on their precise matronly feet, a cat stalked a great green mantis—at last we had settled somewhere Surrey-less." Only occasionally does a piece of description fail to fuse, as if it had been lifted and incorporated straight from a note-book.

JOSEPH BRADDOCK

OUTER MONGOLIA AND ITS INTERNATIONAL POSITION, by Gerard M. Frifters, with an Introduction by Owen Lattimore, was the basis of an article by K. M. Smogorzewski "The Mongolian Republic" in the July 1950 number of THE FORTNIGHTLY. The book is now published in England by Allen & Unwin. 25s.

THE OUTLINE OF HISTORY, by H. G. Wells. (Cassell. 17s. 6d.) is a new edition, revised and brought up to date by Raymond Postgate, with maps and pictures by J. F. Horrabin.

BOOKS ON THE TABLE

There are those who so far from making the pious pilgrimage would not cross a road to see where Chesterton lived or Keats died, holding that *The Defendant* and the "Ode to a Nightingale" are what matters. And, springing as it does from the belief that a man's thoughts must be independent of his surroundings, their case is good enough. But the first book here is not for them.

Genius loci

It is for those who stand outside Casa Guidi windows, awed in the Florentine sunshine because it was here the little child passed singing and the listening Elizabeth Browning found a beginning for the poem, or—beside her husband's grave in Westminster Abbey, remembering the "sunset touch . . . the chorus-ending from Euripides . . ." *SIXTEEN PORTRAITS* (*Naldrett Press*. 18s.) is the National Trust's happy way of presenting 14 men, Beatrix Potter and Ellen Terry who lived in houses under its care. The illustrations by Joan Hassall, from Carlyle's Chelsea home to Shaw's Corner at Ayot St. Lawrence, have the clarity of photographs with the important something more in draughtsmanship to warm and illuminate; the buildings, too, could be indications of the characters of their occupants upon which it is rewarding to ponder. L. A. G. Strong has edited the collection and himself writes the Thomas Hardy essay. With contributions all so ably matching themes it is unfair to single out a Ronald Storrs on T. E. Lawrence or a Stephen Potter on Coleridge, and this most luxurious piece of book production should delight lovers of literature (in whatever dress it comes), the members of the National Trust, and intending but procrastinating members, alike.

England's counties

To present the countryside in which stand some of these homes, two books from *Odhams Press* (10s. 6d. each) are opportune. They are *THE ENGLISH LAKE DISTRICT IN PICTURES*, with a

Foreword and Introductions by Sir Norman Birkett (who is president of the Friends of the Lake District) and *THE HOME COUNTIES IN PICTURES*, Introduced by S. P. B. Mais. To one whose only fortnight's stay at the Lakes was accompanied by unremitting rain and mist so thick that not a mountain, or even the opposite bank of Windermere at Ambleside could be seen, by squelchy tramps about Ruskin's Brantwood, the Herries country of Hugh Walpole and the Wordsworth shrines, followed by huddlings around great fires—and this in July—these hundred and more photographs are harrowing reminders of what was lost. For, as Sir Norman Birkett says, "surpassing beauty" is captured here. More accessible and less capricious are the quieter beauties of Berkshire, Buckinghamshire, Essex, Hertfordshire, Kent, Middlesex and Surrey; a Chiltern beech wood competing in majesty with the hornbeams of Epping Forest, Beaconsfield's bow windows in charm with Farnham's Castle Street, and thatched cottages at Finchingfield with the half-timbered houses of Aldbury, are couplings at random from another more than hundred illustrations of rural joys always surprisingly so near to London.

Step gables

And from the stateliness of Windsor Castle and St. Alban's Abbey to the quays and belfry of Bruges (where rain there was none and the sun gilded to the last the steep roofs on the soft evening air a-tremble with the carillon) with Tudor Edwards in *BELGIUM AND LUXEMBOURG* (*Batsford*. 15s.), another picture book to evoke holiday pleasures and to foster dreams of those to come. Here are recreated all those towns medieval with cloth hall, *hôtel de ville*, convent and, above all, bells, which in retrospect were ever provoking argument on their merits, and whether indeed Malines' were better than Bruges'. So repulsive-attractive is their spell that a walk down Bond Street when the carillon is playing has the same effect as has

the reading of this book—you proceed in a trance of recollection.

How to be a gourmet

If sounds are memory-jerkers, not less so are smells and tastes. Here are three books that literally cater for both. The first two are *A CONTEMPLATION OF WINE* by H. Warner Allen (*Michael Joseph*. 12s. 6d.) and *THE ART OF GOOD LIVING* by André L. Simon, with a Foreword by Sir Francis Meynell (same publisher, same price). One of the first author's chapters celebrates the occasion of the 70th birthday of the second in a tribute that ends with a quotation from *The Art of Good Living*, originally published in 1929. In either of these men there is nothing of the bravado of the boy in 1917 fresh from school, though wearing the uniform of a second lieutenant, who on hearing at table in our house that someone had lately died of *delirium tremens* cast up his eyes and said piously ; "What a wonderful death!" Nor, naturally, do they moralize to the point of asking you to sign the pledge. Theirs are high-spirited panegyrics, on the blessings to be obtained from bringing intelligence and a cultivated palate to the choosing of food and drink, delivered without a single hiccup. Mr. Simon in fact subtitles his book : "A Contribution to the better Understanding of Food and Drink together with a Gastronomic Vocabulary and a Wine Glossary" suitably capital-lettered. Mr. Allen starts his history before Pliny, who complained : "Forty years ago when Tiberius Claudius was Emperor, the habit of drinking on an empty stomach and taking wine regularly before meals came in, an outlandish fad . . ." The progress of the corkscrew is traced in such chapters as : "Good Fellowship in Chaucer's England", "Pasteur and the Wine-Grower", and "Calories and Christmas", and the book ends with a plea for a wine union of western Europe as a prelude to Utopia. Here's to the complete success of WUWE!

Rosemary Hume, the principal of the *Cordon Bleu* School of Cookery, in *PARTY FOOD AND DRINK* (Lighthouse)

Books : *Chatto & Windus*. 2s.) provides for a less *exalté* but equally civilized public. Her chapter headings are a practical guide to her choice of fare and recipes : "Small Dance and Fork Supper", "Wedding Reception", "Tennis Tea", "Sea or River Picnic", "Cocktail"—"Children's"—"Christmas Party" and others, and like Mr. Allen's book, hers is comprehensively indexed. All three, being addressed to a people popularly supposed to be gastronomic Goths, are as subtle in their flattery as was Macbeth when he told the false Thanes to fly "and mingle with the English epicures."

Perennial research

This observation, not nearly so subtly, ushers in the next book, *SHAKESPEARE*, 4 : A series of yearly volumes dealing with Shakespearian discovery, history, criticism and production over all the world (*Cambridge University Press*. 12s. 6d.). Presently despatched from here, it will go to the honoured place on the shelves beside the first three volumes. In this, Kenneth Muir leads off with "Fifty Years of Shakespearian Criticism : 1900-1950", indicates what yet remains to be done in the field, and corroborates hopes and disappointments aroused by Mr. Middleton Murry as critic "before he became a political philosopher." There is a chapter by John Gielgud which will please student and ordinary play-goer (although dogged persistence in face of highly-priced seats surely ranks the second with the first), "Tradition, Style and the Theatre To-day", in which he sees tradition "as a warning as well as an example, a danger as well as an ideal." Then M. C. Bradbrook's helpful expositions of "The Sources of *Macbeth*" leads one to a plea for the Orson Welles film, which seems to have received eyebrow raisings from some of the we-are-the-people-and-wisdom-shall-die-with-us critics. Much in its favour is to be able to see for once how Birnam Wood really did come to Dunsinane. In beauty of voice, commanding presence and brooding manner Orson Welles has

ideal qualifications for Macbeth. If his supporters (particularly Lady M.) are not always his equal, this situation is no phenomenon. And it is not the first time the "book of the film" has been 'adapted', when the proceedings tend to turn into a holy crusade.

The way forward

A man who is not blinkered by 'adaptations', so that he is able to see THIS WAR BUSINESS as it is, is Arthur Guy Enock (*The Bodley Head*. 18s.). The details he gives are indeed, as the dust-jacket says, appalling; one sees no truth in its previous assertion that they are also "fascinating". "Loathsome" would be the appropriate word for the lists of "warlike expenditure" of 24 countries from 1900-1946 and the "war effort 1939-1945" of appliances for killing and maiming. One can only speculate with horror on figures that are accumulating, not disclosed. The author does not play any games of adding and subtracting and balancing to make statistics lie. Instead he goes back to 150 B.C., when conquered Greece became a Roman province, for some of the origins and causes that culminated in the "crash of currencies" of which the devaluation of the pound sterling in 1949 was the ignominious end. Or was it a beginning? The huge book—there are 22 other tables and 49 illustrations in the 375 close-packed pages—is the successor to this pertinacious Quaker's *The Problem of Armaments* which, ironically enough, appeared in 1923. In his concluding chapters "Means of Progress and Steps towards Solution" and "Challenge—the Way Forward" he makes it clear that: "To be free of the burden of this problem is the most urgent aspiration of the human race." And who, even before reading his indictment, could doubt that he is right?

An American Jew

Another large volume, which is also an indictment of the follies of war and an advocate of spiritual values as the

only wisdom, is IN SEARCH, the autobiography of Meyer Levin (Constellation Books: *Vallentine, Mitchell*. 12s. 6d.). It opens with the words: "This is a book about being a Jew", and tells of the Chicago boy who began writing in "the notorious Bloody Nineteenth ward", the incubating ground of gangsters. As reporter, novelist and film-writer—among his books are *Frankie and Johnnie* and *My Father's House* and he made the documentary *The Illegals*—his experiences in America, Europe and Palestine include the Spanish Civil War, the uncovering of Buchenwald and boatloads of unwanted immigrants. He is no Zionist for himself, but recognizes that others can only find in Israel a continuing Jewish culture. There is no rancour, no stressing horror for the purpose of sensationalism, but there is poise, peace and the kind of writing that makes the book, for all its length, hard to put down.

Iago's tales

The contemplation of man's inhumanity to man being a sorry note on which to end a piece that began so cheerfully, animal's animality to man shall have the last word, with KILLERS ALL (*Robert Hale*. 15s.). If Commander Attilio Gatti had not led ten expeditions to Africa and spent 14 years in exploration there, to become "one of the most distinguished authorities on that continent", you might be thinking he was drawing the long bow for boys' delight. Of his chapter-headings, "Ordeal by Smell", "Three Hundred Tons of Charging Buffalo" and "Midgets Introduce Me to Giants" are among the less dramatic. The splendid photographs being full of action match the startling behaviour of gorillas, crocodiles and elephants. Altogether, in warmly commanding these adventures, perhaps they should not be advised for bedtime reading.

GRACE BANYARD.